

## **Children's classics translated from English under Franco: the censorship of the William books and the Adventures of Tom Sawyer.**

Craig, Ian S

The copyright of this thesis rests with the author and no quotation from it or information derived from it may be published without the prior written consent of the author

For additional information about this publication click this link.

<http://qmro.qmul.ac.uk/jspui/handle/123456789/1711>

Information about this research object was correct at the time of download; we occasionally make corrections to records, please therefore check the published record when citing. For more information contact [scholarlycommunications@qmul.ac.uk](mailto:scholarlycommunications@qmul.ac.uk)

CHILDREN'S CLASSICS TRANSLATED  
FROM ENGLISH UNDER FRANCO:  
THE CENSORSHIP OF THE *WILLIAM* BOOKS AND  
*THE ADVENTURES OF TOM SAWYER*

A PhD Thesis by IAN S. CRAIG,  
Queen Mary and Westfield College,  
University of London



## Abstract

The thesis documents the censorship histories of Mark Twain's *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* and Richmal Crompton's *William* books under Franco, and analyses these censorship histories in terms of the changing character of the regime. Previously unconsulted primary sources are used, such as censors' reports and translation proofs held in the Archivo General de la Administración del Estado at Alcalá de Henares. The censors' reports demonstrate that children's literature and translated literature were treated as special cases by the regime, and that censorship was particularly harsh in both areas. These findings demonstrate the crucial importance of attitudes to childhood and foreignness in the Francoist ideological scheme.

The censorship histories of *Tom Sawyer* and the *William* books reveal some surprising facts. The *William* books began to be persecuted by the censors in late 1942, precisely the moment when the regime was seeking a rapprochement with the Allied powers as the course of the War turned in the latter's favour. This prohibition cannot be understood without exploring the factors which differentiate children's literature from adult literature in the context of Francoism. The books' peculiarly English character also had a vital bearing on how they were censored.

The history of *Tom Sawyer* in Spain demonstrates the effect of literary status on censorship practice. Early in the regime, the censors generally considered *Tom Sawyer* to be a work for adults. From the mid-1950s, however, children's literature was inscribed as a special category in censorship legislation, and the censors began to view editions of the work as specifically intended for children. *Tom Sawyer* thus encountered censorship problems in the later years of the regime, supposedly more liberal than the earlier period. Again, these problems would be inexplicable without examining the evolution of the publishing industry and Francoist attitudes to literature and the child.

The thesis also provides a detailed analysis of the type of suppressions imposed on the books studied, under the following headings: religion; love, sexuality and gender; authority and politics, nation and race; crime, terror and violence.

# CONTENTS

	<b>Page</b>
<b>Acknowledgements:</b>	<b>7</b>
 <b>CHAPTER ONE: FRANCOISM and THE NEW RACE</b>	 <b>8</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>8</b>
<b>Part I: Ideology and the New Race</b>	<b>13</b>
(i) The Fundamental Precepts of Francoist Ideology	13
(ii) Hierarchy and Property	14
(iii) Enthusiasm versus Irony	15
(iv) War and Patriotism	17
(v) Conformism	19
(vi) Xenophobia	21
<b>Part II: The Evolution of the Regime</b>	<b>25</b>
(i) The War Years	25
(ii) Post-War Isolation	28
(iii) Cold War Reconciliation	29
(iv) Schizophrenia: The mid-1960s to 1975	30
<b>Part III: Literature, Children's Sexuality and Gender Roles</b>	<b>33</b>
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>44</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<b>47</b>
 <b>CHAPTER TWO: FRANCOIST CENSORSHIP</b>	 <b>52</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>52</b>
<b>Part I: The Character and Evolution of the Censorship Apparatus</b>	<b>52</b>
(i) The Legislative Origins of Francoist Censorship	52
(ii) Early Francoist Censorship: The Arias Salgado years (1941-1962)	56
(iii) Later Francoist Censorship: Fraga and beyond	62
<b>Part II: The Censorship of Translated Literature</b>	<b>73</b>



<b>Part III: The Censorship of Children's Literature:</b>	<b>83</b>
(i) Introduction	83
(ii) The 1956 <i>Reglamento</i>	85
(A) Religion	
(B) Sexuality	
(C) Society and Behaviour	
(D) Irony	
(iii) The 1967 <i>Estatuto</i>	97
(iv) Censorship Practice in the Area of Children's Literature	100
(v) Conclusion	104
<b>Notes</b>	<b>105</b>
 <b>CHAPTER THREE: CENSORSHIP HISTORIES:</b>	 <b>109</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>109</b>
<b>Part I: The Earlier Period</b>	<b>114</b>
(i) <i>William</i> 1938-1956	114
(ii) <i>Tom Sawyer</i> 1938-1956	125
(iii) Conclusion	133
<b>Part II: The Later Period</b>	<b>134</b>
(i) <i>William</i> 1957-1981	134
(ii) <i>Tom Sawyer</i> 1957-1981	144
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>168</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<b>171</b>
 <b>CHAPTER FOUR: RELIGION</b>	 <b>176</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>176</b>
(i) Mockery of the clergy	177
(ii) Mockery of religious scripture and ceremony	183
(iii) Other religious allusions	196
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>198</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<b>200</b>

<b>CHAPTER FIVE: LOVE, SEXUALITY and GENDER</b>	<b>202</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>202</b>
(i) Kissing and flirtation	203
(ii) Premature love	212
(iii) Misogyny and femininity	217
(iv) Adult sexuality	223
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>225</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<b>227</b>
 <b>CHAPTER SIX: AUTHORITY and POLITICS, NATION and RACE</b>	 <b>228</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>228</b>
<b>Part I: Authority and Politics</b>	<b>228</b>
(i) Parents, teachers and other adults	228
(ii) The police	244
(iii) Political figures	246
<b>Part II: Nation and Race</b>	<b>254</b>
(i) Patriotism	254
(ii) Racism	258
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>263</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<b>265</b>
 <b>CHAPTER SEVEN: VIOLENCE, TERROR and CRIME</b>	 <b>268</b>
<b>Introduction</b>	<b>268</b>
(i) Violence and Terror	271
(ii) Crime	281
<b>Conclusion</b>	<b>289</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<b>291</b>
 <b>CONCLUSION</b>	 <b>293</b>
<b>Notes</b>	<b>301</b>

<b>APPENDIX A: THE <i>WILLIAM</i> BOOKS in SPAIN (1938-1981)</b>	<b>302</b>
<b>APPENDIX B: <i>TOM SAWYER</i> in SPAIN (1938-1980)</b>	<b>313</b>
<b>APPENDIX C: OTHER WORKS by MARK TWAIN</b>	<b>324</b>
<b>BIBLIOGRAPHY</b>	<b>326</b>

## **ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS**

I would like to express my particular gratitude to the following people: Abigail Lee Six, for her wise and attentive supervision; my parents John and Barbara Craig for their unflagging moral and financial support; Christopher Pollard for his informed appraisal and proofreading of the final text; the staff of the Archivo General de la Administración del Estado in Alcalá de Henares for their help in retrieving and deciphering censorship documents; the Editorial Molino for the information they generously supplied; the British Academy, for their generous funding during the first three years of the project.

For their scholarly expertise and advice, I am indebted to Julian Blake, Peter Bush, Philip Deacon, Alan Deyermond, Pepe Esteban, Josep-Antón Fernández, Omar García, Nick Harrison, Jo Labanyi, Carmen López Landa, Ane Ortega, Verity Smith and Jane Whetnall. Finally, I would like to thank the following for their generous assistance in various capacities: Venerando Alhambra, Juan Barceló, Jay Hammond, Ana Lima, Ximena Orús, Kay Russell, Germán Sánchez, Andrés Sorel.

## CHAPTER ONE: FRANCOISM and THE NEW RACE

The child is innocence and forgetting, a new beginning, a game, a self-propelled wheel, a first movement, a sacred 'Yes'. For the game of creation, my brothers, a sacred 'yes' is needed.

(Friedrich Nietzsche)<sup>1</sup>

### Introduction

In 1985, Geraldine Cleary Nichols wrote that 'the field of children's literature in the Hispanic world is vast and largely unexplored [...] in the case of children's literature in postwar Spain, an obvious approach, the socioliterary or contextual, has been overlooked until now'.<sup>2</sup> One of the principal aims of the present dissertation is to remedy the continuing dearth of analysis - despite Nichols's own informative contribution - relating to the sociopolitical conditioning of the children's literature market in Franco's Spain. More specifically, I shall argue that the Francoist censorship apparatus regarded children's literature as a category requiring particular vigilance, and that the censors' interventions in the area of children's literature were therefore different in character from those made in adult literature. I shall also assert that the evolution of Francoist censorship practice in the area of children's literature diverges markedly from that of adult literature, and that the way in which particular children's books may have been censored by the regime therefore cannot be surmised merely by reference to existing knowledge regarding the character and evolution of the censorship apparatus overall (discussed in Chapter 2).

Much of the evidence I shall adduce to support the argument that children's literature was treated differently by Franco's censors relates to the regime's concept of foreignness and the dangers of foreign culture. As we shall see in Chapters 2 and 3, Francoist censorship policy in the area of children's literature was especially conditioned by notions of national identity and ethnic purity, with the consequence that foreign books were subjected to particularly close scrutiny if it was felt they were intended for a juvenile readership. In order to assess the impact of this additional xenophobia, Richmal Crompton's *William* books and Mark Twain's *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* have been chosen, by way of example, as the principal texts of this dissertation (hereafter sometimes referred to for convenience as 'the principal works').<sup>3</sup> Further reasons for choosing these works are discussed in Chapter 3, below.

In order to contextualize the censorship of particular children's works described in later chapters, the present chapter addresses the reasons underlying the particular Francoist preoccupation with the child. In this regard, it is necessary to recall that the Franco regime, at least initially, was closely modelled on Italian Fascism and, a little later, Nazism. It is well known that these movements swept to power because they promised clarity, unity and, above all, strength of government at moments of particular social and political instability. The rhetoric of such regimes was therefore often revolutionary in tenor, as they sought to legitimize their violent ascent to power by appealing to the popular yearning for a radical, purifying solution to the problems of corrupt and exhausted political structures and seemingly interminable class conflict.<sup>4</sup>

It has also often been observed, however, that the fascist regimes shared a common paradox: despite their revolutionary claims or intentions, they were also profoundly nostalgic and conservative, aiming to reorganize society according to a pre-capitalist model which they viewed as 'natural', and appealing to racial or ethnic myths of origin in order to legitimize this reorganization. The presence of this paradox in the fascist movements' ideologies explains the extraordinary emphasis they placed on para-military youth movements, and on the status or image of the child generally: the child is the perfect embodiment of the regimes' pledge to herald a new beginning, for the child represents both the absence of past and a promise for the future. At the same time, the child symbolizes *regeneration*, and therefore continuation, and so represents not merely newness, but the perennial renewal of the old. The child is thus a symbol which encapsulates the revolutionary-nostalgic paradox at the heart of fascist ideology.

A more pragmatic analysis might provide a blunter explanation for the fascist preoccupation with the child: the most effective indoctrination is early indoctrination. Effectively indoctrinating the young was a particularly pressing political necessity in the context of post-Civil War Spain, since the adult population was already irremediably polarized into winners and losers. If the regime was to secure its perpetuation, the 'New Race' had to be ideologically homogenized. Censorship of children's literature, the principal subject of this dissertation, was evidently one of the instruments used in this manipulative enterprise.

Particularly in the case of translated literature, however, censorship was merely a passive instrument of control, a response to something which already existed. School textbooks, on the other hand, constituted an active instrument of control, in the sense that they sought to influence the child directly, and could be written to the precise specification of National-Catholic ideology. Since a very clear picture of the model Francoist child emerges from such texts, they are the principal source used in Parts I and II of the present chapter. The specific features of this model child are clearly pertinent to the present dissertation, since the principal works discussed in succeeding chapters have child protagonists. The extent to which these protagonists conform to, or diverge from, the Francoist notion of how a child should be and how s/he should behave is likely to have had a significant bearing on how the works were received by the regime.

Certain questions pertaining to the overall Francoist world view, as opposed to the regime's specific notion of childhood, are also addressed in the present chapter. Because they are aimed at children, early Francoist school readers articulate the general ideological precepts of Francoism in particularly bald fashion. As with the child paradigm, the Francoist world view which emerges from the school readers discussed in the present chapter will later help to explain the censors' responses to the principal works and other foreign literary texts.

The description of the Francoist world view, as it is manifested in the school readers, also serves to question the claim that the Franco regime lacked any official ideology. This alleged feature of the regime has been used to differentiate Francoism from the archetypal fascist movements of Mussolini and Hitler.<sup>5</sup> As will become apparent below, however, the evidence of early Francoist discourse suggests that an official ideology did in fact exist. Because of the heterogeneous composition of the regime's hegemonic group, this ideology was intellectually incoherent and self-contradictory to an unusually high degree, but an ideology it undoubtedly was.

With regard to this question, it is important to recall a crucial factor which distinguished Francoism from Italian Fascism and Nazism: the immense relative longevity of the Spanish regime. Spain under Franco simply lacked the means or inclination, after an exhausting Civil War, to undertake the expansionist enterprises which ultimately brought about the cataclysmic downfall of the Italian and German

totalitarian movements. Having outlived the epoch of Fascism's appeal, it was thus inevitable that the Franco regime would display ever greater ideological contradictions as it sought to reconcile its very real sense of spiritual superiority with the pragmatic necessity of cooperating politically and, above all, economically with the rest of the world. The regime thus modified its ideology over time, but this was largely a question of adjusting the proportions of the ideological ingredients, rather than changing the recipe altogether.

Relatedly, the purpose of the second part of Chapter 1 is to chart the evolution of the regime from its inception to its demise, and thus suggest how we might expect its changing character to have affected the specific area of censorship practice. By first establishing the nature of the official ideology, and by charting the regime's evolution, certain questions concerning Francoism generally can then be elucidated in the course of the examination of censorship itself: broadly speaking, any disparity between the regime's proclaimed ideals and its actual censorship activities will be laid bare. It will thus be clearer to what extent Francoism was merely an authoritarian system of control designed to keep its hegemonic group in power, or a truly totalitarian attempt at a politico-spiritual revolution in the service of a millenary goal. In fact, it is generally accepted that it was both of these things at different times (see note 5). Examining censorship practice in the light of official ideology may help to determine when totalitarian conviction gave way to authoritarian pragmatism, and how this shift manifested itself (if it did so) in a specific area of government (book censorship).

The relationship between the overall visible character of the regime and the mechanisms of control it employed beneath the surface is particularly interesting in the case of the later Francoist period (from the late 1950s onwards), since this phase was characterized by oscillations between liberalization (to placate foreign trading partners and increasingly powerful internal progressive forces) and reactionary backlash (to assuage the powerful 'ultra' factions which still held sway in the armed forces and other centres of power). By examining censorship practice in the light of the wider picture, the extent to which the liberalizations of later Francoism were cosmetic or real can be ascertained.

I have felt it important to point up clearly the specific implications of the evidence presented. Throughout the account of Francoist ideology and evolution,



therefore, italicized sections summarize the significance of the particular feature of ideology or period of evolution under discussion. In these sections, specific deductions are also made concerning how censorship practice might be expected to have been shaped by a given feature of the ideology or by a given event in the evolution of the regime. This procedure assumes a deliberately over-simplified correspondence between censorship practice and the proclaimed ideology, and between censorship practice and the wider political situation. This over-simplified relationship is assumed simply in order to construct a 'control' model of Francoist censorship. In later chapters, this control will be compared with real censorship practice in order to reveal any disparity between proclaimed intentions and actual policy.

In the final part of Chapter 1, the principal documentary sources used are Francoist prescriptions for children's reading material. These prescriptions take the form of articles from the 1940s printed in the principal official publishing journal *Bibliografía Hispánica*, which was aimed at booksellers, publishers and librarians. In these articles, three particular features emerge which are relevant to the present dissertation: the regime's conception of gender roles; relatedly, the orthodox fear and repression of sexuality; and the Francoist attitude to books and their pedagogic function.<sup>6</sup>

The exposition of the first two features further refines the orthodox definition of the Francoist child, treated in Part I, and also extends it to cover specifically the model Francoist girl. The regime's notion of femininity is clearly relevant to the censorship of imported children's books, since these often contain female characters (this applies to both *Tom Sawyer* and the *William* books), whose degree of divergence from the Francoist paradigm may have influenced the censor's response. The evidence of a desire to inculcate sexual repression in children of both sexes bears on both the Francoist conception of the child analysed in preceding sections, and on the censorship criteria the regime adopted, discussed in Chapter 2. The exposition of the third feature which emerges from these articles, Francoist attitudes to literature and its pedagogic function, also serves to link the theme of children with that of censorship. As in Parts I and II, certain specific conclusions and predictions are presented in italics at the end of Part III.

## **Part I: Ideology and the New Race**

### **(i) The Fundamental Precepts of Francoist Ideology**

As suggested above, Francoist ideology is difficult to define in precise terms because of its heterogeneity and longevity.<sup>7</sup> Certain dominant features can be readily identified, however: revenge rhetoric against left-wing ideology; militant nationalism (with its corollary, xenophobia); fundamentalist Catholicism (whose most dominant feature was sexual repression). All three principal ideological strands were closely intertwined in the discourse of Francoist propaganda. The first two strands, revenge rhetoric and militant nationalism, were frequently linked, so that the internal and external enemies of the regime could be neatly identified with each other in a circular definition of evil: the Republic betrayed Spain's essence by building a society according to foreign models, because/therefore there is a long-standing international conspiracy to impose Communism on the cherished Fatherland.

The Caudillo's abhorrence of Communism and Freemasonry can hardly be exaggerated. In March 1940 the *Ley de Represión de la Masonería y el Comunismo* was passed, which established the *Tribunal Especial para la Represión de la Masonería y el Comunismo*.<sup>8</sup> The opening sentences of this piece of legislation attributed all of Spain's historic ills to 'la acción conjunta de la masonería y de las fuerzas anarquizantes, movidas a su vez por ocultos resortes internacionales' (Gubern, p.52). This conception of Spain as a bastion of righteousness under siege from the forces of evil was repeatedly used by Franco to arouse militant nationalist sentiments in the populace. The circularity of the argument, in which blame is simultaneously attributed to domestic traitors and dark foreign powers, is vividly illustrated in the following school textbook account of the Second Republic and the Civil War:

En las elecciones del 16 de febrero de 1936 volvieron a triunfar las izquierdas, las cuales cogieron el Poder llenas de rabia y amenazando con el establecimiento de una feroz dictadura del proletariado, al estilo de Rusia. [...] Rusia había soñado con clavar la hoz ensangrentada de su emblema en este hermoso pedazo de Europa, y todas las masas comunistas y socialistas de la tierra, unidas con masones y judíos, anhelaban triunfar en España, tomándola como un peldaño de oro para triunfar en el mundo.<sup>9</sup>

Nationalistic and religious propaganda are synthesized in similar fashion: patriotic rhetoric is couched in pseudo-theological terms, so that the nation's political

and cultural destiny is identified with its role as an exemplary stronghold of conservative Christian values:

España sola ha bautizado a más infieles que el resto de todas las naciones juntas. En la Gran Cruzada de España contra el marxismo internacional, los españoles hemos luchado por la civilización cristiana, y, al triunfar contra sus enemigos, hemos servido al destino que la Providencia señaló a la nación española.<sup>10</sup>

The various components of Francoist ideology, then, stood in a mutually referential relation to each other. This does not mean, however, that each component was invoked merely to justify another, in an exclusively circular fashion, for as school textbooks reveal, each of the main ideological currents also fed into more precisely defined, peripheral channels of propaganda. The specific propaganda features which relate to the censorship of foreign children's literature are described below.

## (ii) Hierarchy and Property

Anti-Republican rhetoric was employed, logically, to justify the implantation of a monolithic and immutable social hierarchy, in which production managers and workers were expected to collaborate in a centrally imposed industrial 'harmony'. The principal symbol of this new system of organization was the notorious *sindicato vertical*. In the peculiar style of the textbooks of the era, the child is directly instructed what to think about the *sindicatos verticales* by the use of the first person:

Encuentro muy natural esta forma de sindicación, porque no se trata sólo de que las clases sociales se conozcan y entiendan, sino de evitar que haya clases sociales. 'Muerto el perro, muerta la rabia', dice el refrán. No habiendo clases, no hay lucha. En el sindicato vertical, no hay clases: todos son productores.

(*Así quiero ser*, p.151)

Similarly, the explicit rejection of <sup>left-wing principles</sup> is used to inculcate the literally 'sacred' status of private property:

Hubo un señor, que dicen que era un sabio, y que escribió estas palabras: 'la propiedad es un robo'. Y yo, que no soy un sabio, sino un niño, digo sencillamente: 'sin propiedad no podría vivir nadie'. [...] La propiedad legítimamente adquirida y disfrutada es sagrada, y nadie debe atentar contra ella. (*Así quiero ser*, p.72)

The advocacy of strict social hierarchy and the sacredness of private property can thus be considered as specific peripheral features of the regime's general posture of rabid antagonism toward left-wing ideology. The former characteristic, especially,

was repeatedly invoked in school text books as the guiding principle of healthy social organization:

Máxima: Mi estado español es vertical, organizado por escalas de jerarquía de arriba abajo; es, pues, la forma de organización más perfecta que se conoce. UN CAUDILLO. UN MANDO. UN SÍ. (*Así quiero ser*, p.11)

*It is reasonable to assume, therefore, that subversion of traditional class hierarchy, or the portrayal of alternative forms of organization, may have constituted a prohibited category in Francoist censorship practice. Equally, literary references questioning the right to own private property and, relatedly, portrayals or exaltations of theft might be expected to have formed part of the regime's censorship criteria.*

### (iii) Enthusiasm vs. Irony

Another significant propaganda feature is the promotion of cheerfulness or enthusiasm. This seems to contradict, or at least to qualify strongly the exhortation to be sober and austere of character, also a prominent feature of propaganda texts.<sup>11</sup> The difficulty of reconciling the simultaneous demand that the child be both sober and cheerful generates a typically paradoxical rhetorical formula: 'Debemos vivir con austeridad, sin dilapidar nuestra existencia en cosas frívolas. Debemos vivir, pues, seriamente. Ahora bien, no queremos decir que tengamos que vivir con tristeza. Todo lo contrario, pues la alegría es también una cosa muy seria y respetable' (*Así quiero ser*, pp.54-55).

It is clear that the cheerfulness being advocated is of a certain restricted type, consisting of a blindly enthusiastic optimism or joyfulness. This type of joyfulness, which seems to be a constant of authoritarian regimes, is vividly evoked by Milan Kundera, through the male narrator of his novel *The Joke*, in the context of post-revolutionary Prague:

It was the first year after February 1948. A new life had begun, a genuinely new and different life, and its features - they are imprinted upon my memory - were rigid and grave. The odd thing was that the gravity of those features took the form of a smile, not a frown. That's right, those years told the world they were the most radiant of years, and anyone who failed to rejoice was immediately suspected of lamenting the victory of the working class or (what was equally criminal) giving way *individualistically* to inner sorrows.

Not only was I unencumbered with inner sorrows; I was blessed with a considerable sense of fun. And even so I can't say I wore the joyous physiognomy of the times: my sense of fun was too frivolous. No, the joy in vogue was devoid of irony and practical jokes; it was, as I have said, of a

highly serious variety, the self-proclaimed *historical optimism of the victorious class*, a solemn and ascetic joy - in short, Joy with a capital J.<sup>12</sup>

Kundera's narrator pinpoints a crucial characteristic of the 'solemn and ascetic joy' of authoritarian regimes: its lack of irony. The narrator of the novel soon discovers that the regime not only lacks irony, but is also vehemently hostile towards it: he is sent to a labour camp for sending a postcard bearing the sardonic message: 'Optimism is the opium of the people! A healthy atmosphere stinks of stupidity! Long live Trotsky! Ludvik'.

Kundera's tale thus reveals the authoritarian advocacy of joy for what it is: an incitement to conform and an expression of the fear of subversion through irony. The relevance of Kundera's portrayal to the Spanish case is confirmed by the explicit condemnation of scepticism, the source of irony, in Francoist propaganda: 'Se dice que una persona es escéptica cuando no tiene fe en nada. [...] Liberalismo y escepticismo son una misma cosa' (*Así quiero ser*, p.30).

Whether or not the ideologues believed this theoretical justification for condemning scepticism (its equation with a faithless nihilism), it is clear that they were also well aware of the sheer practical advantages of keeping the post-Civil War generation as credulous as they could, as the following textbook instruction to teachers demonstrates: 'El alma de estos niños tiene una plasticidad asombrosa para quedarse con la huella de los grandes ejemplos. Después, el contacto con las ásperas realidades de la vida los endurecerá con el hálito seco del escepticismo' (Serrano de Haro, 1966, p.4). It is harder to imagine a balder expression of the motives which lie behind the authoritarian desire to indoctrinate early: the Francoist ideologues clearly believed that the thorough inculcation of irrational dogma at an early stage would effectively prolong childhood, thus delaying, if not obviating altogether, the subject's acquisition of adult critical distance.

*It is therefore reasonable to assume that literary representations of sarcastic or ironical characters (and especially child characters) were regarded as unsuitable examples for the future torchbearers of National-Catholicism, and may therefore have been suppressed. On a more subtle level, it is possible that literary irony generally may have been deemed unsuitable in children's books, since it might tend to cultivate the subversive capacity to assume critical distance.*

#### (iv) War and Patriotism

The sanctification of private property and the advocacy of a strict hierarchical social structure in Francoist discourse, described in section (ii), reflect the regime's attempt to legitimize its actual restructuring of society according to traditional pre-capitalist property relations (Muñoz, p.7). This legitimization was necessary in order to achieve the regime's most pressing post-Civil War objective, the restoration and maintenance of public order. In the service of this objective, other propaganda features were employed, such as the continual exhortation to work for the nation's benefit: 'Escribe y aprende: yo he de trabajar cuanto pueda para que mi España sea rica y feliz'.<sup>13</sup>

This attempt to mobilize the populace in the service of the nation differs crucially from its Nazi equivalent. In the Nazi case, mobilization was used as a real, practical instrument of war in a program of imperialist expansionism. Even the most ambitious Francoist ideologues, on the other hand, though they may have believed their own propaganda envisaging a Hispanic world empire, were realistic enough to defer its establishment to a hypothetical future. The very best that the regime could realistically hope for, in terms of empire building, was to negotiate for itself a share of the spoils in the event of an Axis victory in the Second World War. After a long and bloody civil war the country was so deeply divided, and so spiritually and economically depleted, that gaining territory by direct, unassisted military intervention was out of the question. Immediate priority had to be given, therefore, to the imposition of peace and public order. One of many ideological contradictions was thus precipitated: though paying lip-service to fascist-based imperialist bellicosity, Francoist propaganda simultaneously underlines the necessity for peace. Thus one textbook instructs the teacher to ensure 'que se gocen los niños en el sedante de la paz y del trabajo' (Serrano de Haro, 1966, p.49), a vivid illustration of the desire to anaesthetize and thus control the populace through mobilization in the service of the state.

At the same time, however, the teachers must underline an important distinction: 'en la formación moral de los niños no puede prescindirse de la distinción entre guerras justas e injustas' (Serrano de Haro, 1940, p.74). Neither does the avowed love of peace preclude exaltation of the military lifestyle or of patriotic sacrifice in war: 'Me gusta prepararme para la vida militar, ejercitándome en los movimientos físicos y en el espíritu disciplinado y sereno de los soldados' (*Así quiero ser*, p.55).<sup>14</sup>

Despite this ambivalence regarding the specific question of war, it is clear from pedagogical sources that the regime made a genuine attempt, using the education system, to replace the individual will of its subjects with blind obedience to patriotic dogma. The desirability of achieving this end was explicitly articulated by the first Francoist Minister of Education, speaking to an audience of primary school teachers: 'Una de esas ideas liberales era la de que hay que respetar, sobre todo, la conciencia del niño y la conciencia del maestro; que la educación es respetar el sentido natural de los educandos y su libertad. Pues bien; yo quiero que meditéis que la idea contraria es el eje de toda la filosofía de la educación patriótica'.<sup>15</sup>

The necessity of suppressing individual will was duly communicated to teachers through school textbooks, in which they were implicitly warned that the child must be trained not to act as a mere observer nor, by extension, to criticize the patriotic enterprise, but rather simply to work blindly towards it as a tiny unit in a supposedly coherent, 'organic' whole: 'ellos no han de ser testigos de la gran empresa, sino parte viva y activa, una célula más del organismo secular de España' (Serrano de Haro, 1940, p.86).

What assumptions might it be reasonable to make, then, about the censorship of translated children's literature given the obvious importance of patriotism in the Francoist ideological scheme? Firstly, it might safely be surmised that any negative references to Spain itself, or to its subjects, might be removed from or modified in children's texts. A further, more complicated question is raised, however: how might the censors react to patriotic, or unpatriotic, sentiments or acts attributed to non-Spanish children (or adults)? Would an allusion to a non-Spanish child expressing patriotic sentiments or performing patriotic deeds be thought inappropriate because the exalted country was not Spain? At an even higher level of subtlety, would a *satirical* description of a patriotic English boy or girl, for example, be considered pernicious because it satirized patriotism generally, or beneficial because it ridiculed allegiance to an enemy power?

These questions exemplify one of the significant general issues in the censorship of translated literature: with what degree of subtlety does a given censorship apparatus operate with respect to literary representations which do not directly concern itself and its own national image? As we shall see in later chapters,

such considerations of literary viewpoint are crucial to an understanding of Francoist censorship practice. With regard to the specific matter of how the censor will respond to representations of non-Spanish patriotism, the propaganda provides us with a significant clue: 'A un buen nacional español no le parece mal que un italiano, por ejemplo, sea un perfecto nacional de su nación. Al contrario, cuánto más quiero yo a España, más quiero que un italiano quiera a Italia, un alemán a Alemania y un portugués a Portugal' (*Así quiero ser*, p.28).

*With regard to patriotism, it thus appears that the general notion of the child as a fervent and obedient patriot is the overriding feature of the ideology, rather than the exaltation of Spain, and Spain alone, through representations of patriotism. We might thus expect that representations of patriotic foreign nationals, children or otherwise, were deemed acceptable, but that mockery of patriotism may not have been.<sup>16</sup>*

*In the light of the regime's ambivalent posture with respect to war, however, it is rather more difficult to predict how bellicose sentiments, representations of war itself, or indeed of violence generally, might be dealt with by the Francoist censors. In this case, the actual practice of censorship may reveal which side of a contradictory propaganda feature actually reflects the regime's intentions and, conversely, which side is merely empty rhetoric. Whatever the attitude to war itself, however, representations of military discipline and mobilization in the service of the nation are likely to have been viewed favourably.*

#### (v) Conformism

As with the suppression of irony or scepticism discussed in section (iii), the inculcation of patriotism in the Francoist child can be viewed as a means of achieving the broader aim of securing the child's unquestioning obedience to orthodox dogma. By implanting an extreme degree of ethnic zeal in children, and exhorting them to work ceaselessly in the service of the Fatherland, the regime ensured that children's knowledge of the world and sense of themselves were predicated on an irrational ideological construct. Thus the adults such children became would be rendered incapable of rational criticism of the social reality around them, since their most



powerful formative experiences had denied them the sense of individual identity from which personal conviction derives.

The exhortation to be industrious was designed to achieve the same goal: instructed to work blindly in collective ventures, the child was discouraged from acquiring a sense of itself as a creator of its own works. Again, this suppression of its individuality tended towards preventing it from acquiring inquisitive - let alone critical - habits.

In keeping with the Francoist conception of society as an 'organic' or divinely prescribed hierarchy, described in section (ii), the Fatherland was only the highest of several layers of authority to which the child owed obedience. The child also stood at the bottom of the sub-hierarchies of family and school: 'En mi casa manda mi padre; en la escuela, el maestro; en el pueblo, el alcalde; en la provincia, el gobernador; en España, el Caudillo. Este manda en todos, porque tiene la responsabilidad de todos. Obedezcámosle para que haga a España feliz' (*Así quiero ser*, p.21).

In its turn, the inculcation of obedience can be viewed as the most important specific feature of a more general desire to generate conformity. Children were thus not only encouraged to be passively obedient when given orders, but also to contribute actively to maintaining social order by conforming: 'Máxima: quiero ser una persona útil, engranada en el gran organismo social. [...] No quiero perturbar nada, al contrario, mi ilusión es contribuir a la armonía de una España bien organizada' (*Así quiero ser*, p.51). Similarly, the child was specifically discouraged from publicly expressing displeasure of any kind, even if this was mere aesthetic disapproval: '[Ante una obra de teatro] aplaude siempre, aunque la representación no te haya complacido. [...] Los juicios desfavorables nunca se deben decir en alta voz, ni ante cualquier público'.<sup>17</sup>

It thus becomes apparent that conformism was the fundamental characteristic of the model Francoist child. The child's conformism could be manifested in the various specific ways adumbrated above: by respecting social hierarchy and the law, and by being unquestioningly joyful, industrious and patriotic.

*Given the preeminence of conformism in the Francoist ideological scheme, it is reasonable to assume that representations in which wilful nonconformity go*

*unpunished, or in which they are exalted, might have been regarded as inappropriate reading matter for children.*

(vi) Xenophobia

The Francoist exaltation of patriotism discussed in section (iv) raises the related question of the regime's posture with regard to specific nations. The regime's attitude to England and the United States are of particular relevance to this dissertation, given the provenance of the principal works discussed. In this section this attitude is outlined, in order to situate the censorship histories of *Tom Sawyer* and the *William* books described in Chapter 3.

The question of the regime's attitude to specific nations is complicated because it works on two levels: one must consider the 'deep' or historical image of a given nation based on its projection through accounts of history, a projection which includes its perceived level of sympathy with the Nationalist cause during the Civil War, but one must also bear in mind the regime's 'shallow' or circumstantial attitude to particular countries, which was determined largely by their political power and consequent capacity to affect Spain's immediate political and economic plight. Until the end of the Second World War, this scheme was largely free of contradiction: the historical enemies coincided, broadly, with the contemporary ones. With the defeat of the Axis powers, however, the situation became more complicated, so that the deep image often sat uncomfortably with the politically expedient shallow attitudes the regime was forced to adopt, as will become apparent in Part II of the present chapter.

Though the image of Britain and the United States (as well as France) necessarily improved as a consequence of the outcome of the War, there is no doubt that all three countries were viewed as historically antipathetic to Spain. In fact, the principal scapegoat in Francoist accounts of history is France, whose intervention in Spanish affairs through Felipe V de Borbón allegedly provoked nothing less than the perversion of Spain's historical destiny:

En el transcurso del siglo dieciocho se operó una transformación notabilísima en la vida de España. Y muchos escritores creen que 'se desmoronó piedra a piedra cuanto la había hecho sabia, poderosa y temida en el mundo'. *España imitó demasiado a Francia*, desviándose de su trayectoria histórica y empezando un camino peligroso: querer ser lo que no es. Bajo la apariencia deslumbradora de una prosperidad material, que resurgía, iba extinguiéndose

y amortiguándose el recio espíritu de la España imperial y auténtica. (Italics as in original, Serrano de Haro, 1940, p.240)

Barely behind France in the ranking of historical enemies, however, is England, specifically identified as the chief accomplice in Spain's loss of empire: 'Ninguna nación ha sido más cómplice y causante de nuestra ruina imperial que Inglaterra'.<sup>18</sup> Both England and France are demonized for their anti-Catholicism, as the following extract from the norms governing history teaching demonstrates: 'La revolución inglesa. Su carácter hipócritamente puritano y tiránicamente anti-católico. La revolución francesa. Sus orígenes enciclopédicos, masónicos y anticatólicos'.<sup>19</sup>

The historical anti-Catholic excesses of both countries are used elsewhere to mitigate the activities of the Inquisition, thus refuting the 'leyenda negra', described as 'chismes fraguados por los escritores protestantes extranjeros' (Serrano de Haro, 1940, p.221).

Like France and England, the United States is identified as a historical enemy, principally for inflicting defeat on Spain in the Cuban War. In reality, of course, this provoked a deep sense of humiliation and sorrow in Spain, sentiments immortalized in the writings of the *Generación del 98*. Francoist histories for children, predictably, suppress the overwhelming nature of the defeat, attributing it to treachery and exaggerating the scant benefits to Spain of the final settlement, as Andrés Sopena Monsalve ironically recalls:

Pero la *lectura* de la lección iba de que los Estados Unidos estaban detrás del asunto y azuzaban a cubanos, filipinos y puertorriqueños contra nosotros. Fíjate que le metían fuego a un barco suyo y nos echaban la culpa y nos declaraban la guerra y nos ganaban. Pero la victoria les costó cara, que nos dieron 20 millones de dólares y se enteraron de lo que era enfrentarse con españoles. (Italics as in original, Sopena, pp.190-91).

The alleged national characteristics which make up the negative image of the United States generally, however, differ somewhat from those attributed to England. Whereas the latter is vilified for its historical anti-Catholicism, the United States is demonized, with more than a hint of eurocentric snobbery, for having no history at all, as the teaching norms again reveal: 'Los Estados Unidos de América. Sentido materialista e inferior de la civilización norteamericana. Ausencia de fundamento y de unidad moral' (Tuñón de Lara, p.36).

Significantly, the chief pernicious characteristic attributed to the United States is materialism, an evil it shares with post-Revolution France, as we have seen, and with the Soviet Union: 'El comunismo. Su materialismo. La transformación del hombre en máquina' (Tuñón de Lara, p.36).

The fascist nostalgia for a pre-industrial age is revealed in this implicit equation of the two emerging superpowers: both capitalism and communism, crystallizing into the two alternative forms of organization and of ideology in the rest of the developed world, are identified as suffering from a common ill. All antipathetic Western imperial powers, past and present are thus demonized in a single interpretative synthesis: the scourge of materialism is historically attributable to the Enlightenment, for which France is to blame. The scourge has spread in two different forms: in the form of socialism to the Soviet bloc, and in the form of capitalism, whose principle champion is the United States. The former manifestation is considered especially reprehensible because it incorporates atheism. The latter is little better, however, because the North Americans are descendants of the historically antipathetic and 'hypocritical' English puritans.

The chief reason for disseminating such schematized images of other nations was, evidently, to serve contemporary propaganda ends. The regime desperately needed to legitimize its own forceful seizure of power in order to bring an end to internal conflict and thus secure its own perpetuation.<sup>20</sup> The Second World War also provided a convenient pretext for the regime's use of xenophobic propaganda. The historical image of France, England, Russia and the United States was thus blackened by ascribing to them appropriately antagonistic roles in representations of historical events. In schoolbook accounts of the Civil War, for example, a clear dichotomy is evident between anathematized nations portrayed as unsympathetic to the Nationalist cause, on the one hand, and exalted allies on the other. The following contemporary account exemplifies this stereotyping:

El mundo, aterrado ante los crímenes de la revolución y ante el peligro del contagio, vio claramente que el triunfo de Franco era la garantía y la salvaguardia de la civilización. Por eso la Santa Sede, Alemania, Italia, el Japón, Portugal, etc., fueron reconociendo al Gobierno nacional como único Gobierno legítimo de España.

[...] Ante el peligro de que la cuestión española se convirtiera en cuestión europea, se creó en Londres el famoso Comité de no intervención. Y mientras la diplomacia del mundo discutía, España se desangraba.

[...] Y naciones que se dicen defensores de la justicia, como Inglaterra y Francia, atendían a los turbios manejos de Negrín y sus gentes. (Serrano de Haro, 1940, pp.298-301)

The following account of the outbreak of the Second World War itself, published in 1940, further exemplifies the use of emotive national stereotypes:

Las grandes naciones que han dirigido esta lucha son nuestras naciones amigas Alemania, Italia y Japón, cuya política se distingue por una gran valentía contra el pretendido dominio de las que se llaman 'democracias' (Inglaterra, Francia, Estados Unidos). Rompiendo las marañas diplomáticas, Alemania se ha incorporado las viejas tierras que le pertenecían [...]; Italia realizó un desembarco decisivo en Albania [...]; y Japón va dominando todo el extremo Oriente en una lucha tenaz y gloriosa contra los comunistas chinos [...].

Pero Inglaterra y Francia, y principalmente la primera, acostumbradas a ser las directoras de la política universal y a explotar en su beneficio las más grandes riquezas de la tierra, no se han resignado a este enérgico resurgir de los países totalitarios.

[...] Inglaterra y Francia declararon la guerra a Alemania (septiembre de 1939) y pensaron filtrarse hábilmente por los países que ocupan el norte de la nación germana; pero Hitler se les anticipó, y las fuerzas del Reich, con una bravura y una técnica militar que ha llenado de asombro al mundo, han conquistado en unas cuantas semanas Dinamarca, Noruega, Luxemburgo, Holanda, Bélgica y dilatadísimas regiones de Francia, inclusive París y toda la costa atlántica hasta la frontera española (junio de 1940). Francia, humillada y vencida, pidió la paz.

[...] Alemania sigue derrumbando el poderío inglés con certeros ataques y durísimos castigos marítimos y aéreos. Londres, corazón y orgullo de Inglaterra y de su Imperio, gime, aterrado y confuso, viendo desplomarse sus torres y su grandeza bajo la acción implacable de los bombarderos alemanes.

La mano firme y experta de Franco va guiando con maestría incomparable el timón de la vida de España en medio de tantos y tan trascendentales acontecimientos. (Serrano de Haro, 1940, pp.298-301)

*Given the evidence constituted by the regime's explicit propaganda, we might logically surmise that children's works from England and the United States (as well as France and Russia), were unfavourably received by the regime in its early years. Works which display or exalt the specific national characteristics regarded as negative in the orthodox scheme - Protestantism in the case of both England and the United States, materialism in the case of the latter - are likely to have been viewed with particular hostility.*

## **Part II: The Evolution of the Regime**

### **(i) The War Years**

War propaganda of the kind cited above is a particularly localized and circumstantial tool, however, depending as it does on the fluctuating fortunes of the parties in conflict. The extent to which the regime was ultimately forced to moderate its posture towards foreign nations is illustrated by the radically truncated account of the events cited above (and the conclusion of the War) in the 1964 edition of the same book. The later account significantly modifies the original by using less emotive language and assuming a more objective point of view:

Inglaterra y Francia declararon la guerra a Alemania. Y Alemania, para ocupar las mejores posiciones, se apoderó rápidamente de Dinamarca, Holanda, Bélgica, Noruega y Luxemburgo. Sus ejércitos penetraron en Francia y tomaron dilatadas regiones, inclusive París (1940). Francia, entonces, vencida, pidió la paz.

[...] Y el mundo siguió gimiendo bajo la guerra implacable y tremenda, que si al principio se presentó favorable al Eje (Alemania, Italia, Japón) se convirtió después en una serie ininterrumpida de victorias para los Aliados (Inglaterra, Estados Unidos, Rusia, China).

[...] Por fin, Alemania fue vencida, dominada y ocupada por los Aliados, muriendo Hitler, su jefe [...]. En medio de tanto espanto y tanta ruina [...] se escuchaba sin cesar la voz angustiada del Papa Pío XII pidiendo a los hombres que cesaran la guerra, y que en el mundo renaciera la justicia y la paz. Así ocurrió en España, donde la mano firme y experta de Franco fue guiando con maestría el timón de la Patria.<sup>21</sup>

The significantly less partisan tone of this account reflects the decisive shift of allegiances forced on the regime by the defeat of the Axis powers, which could be foreseen after the battle of Stalingrad. Franco's posture of outright public support for the Axis at the beginning of hostilities was quickly modified to a guardedly conciliatory stance towards the Allies from the end of 1942 onwards.<sup>22</sup> This shift is also vividly illustrated by contemporary accounts of the rival Axis and Allied propaganda apparatuses in Madrid. The British Ambassador to Spain during the war, Sir Samuel Hoare, reported on his arrival in May 1940 that:

I have seen enough to realize the fact that our present machine is totally inadequate. I have never seen so complete a control of the means of communication, press, propaganda, aviation, etc., as the Germans have here. Indeed, I would go as far as to say that the Embassy and I are existing here only on German sufferance.<sup>23</sup>

As early as 1941, however, Hoare was striking a decidedly more optimistic note:

Since I have been here Spanish feeling has greatly changed. It is now definitely anti-German and it only needs some British success to become at least in certain directions definitely pro-British. [...] There is a great gulf between general opinion in Spain and the Germanophile views in certain Government circles. (Cited in Hurtley, p.54)

It was not only Hoare's political diplomacy which facilitated the rapprochement between Spain and England, however. The British Institute in Madrid, founded in 1940 under the directorship of Walter Starkie, had promoted British interests in Spain in the cultural sphere by organizing receptions, exhibitions, concerts, parties, dances and a Sunday afternoon *tertulia* regularly patronized by Pío Baroja (Hurtley, p.77). Starkie's account of the period broadly coincides with Hoare's (though the two often clashed on strategic matters) in registering an upsurge of anglophile sentiment from as early as 1941: 'We have made this house a centre of cultural and social life and many Spaniards have said the entertainments here surpass those of any other Institute, or indeed Embassy, in Madrid' (cited in Hurtley, p.73).

Hoare's observation that the regime itself seemed to lag behind the populace at large in this shift of allegiance is reflected in the progress of Starkie's cultural propaganda mission. Thus although the Institute's register of English-language students increased from one hundred members at the beginning of 1941 to over one thousand by November 1942 (Hurtley, p.77), it was not until mid-1944 that English was given equal status with German as a foreign language in schools (Hurtley, p.83). Similarly, though Hoare noticed the shift in popular affections in 1941, the germanophile Minister for Foreign Affairs Ramón Serrano Suñer was not replaced until the end of 1942, and neutrality was not resumed, nor the 'División Azul' withdrawn, until 1943.

As far as relations with the United States were concerned, a similar ambivalence prevailed during the period 1942 to 1945, as the regime struggled to reconcile ideological conviction with pragmatic necessity. At the end of July 1943, the American ambassador Carlton Hayes sent a communiqué to Franco in which he complained about the pro-Axis bias in the Spanish press. The *Vicesecretaría de Educación Popular* quickly replied with reassurances that the newspapers and radio stations had been instructed to observe strict neutrality in their reporting (Gubern,

p.54). The extent to which the regime was still hedging its bets at this stage is revealed by the historian Max Gallo's claim that a secret note was sent to the press instructing them to 'continuar como en el pasado'.<sup>24</sup>

Later in the same year (October), the Americans in particular responded indignantly when Franco allowed his Minister for Foreign Affairs, El Conde de Jordana, to send a telegram of congratulation to José P. Laurel, who had been installed as puppet governor of the Philippines by the Japanese (*Franco*, p.502).

The Spanish regime incurred the wrath of the Allies, and the Americans in particular, once again in 1944, when it stepped up exports of wolfram, used to make machine tools and shells, to the Third Reich. The Americans responded to this and other pro-Axis activities by imposing an oil embargo on Spain (*Franco*, p.508). By June 1944, Franco was forced to accept that the Allies had to be placated if Spain was not to be ruined economically. All pro-Axis activities were therefore either ceased altogether, or scaled down to virtually nothing (*Franco*, p.511).

Throughout these crises, it was clear that the United States favoured a more uncompromising approach towards the Franco regime than did Britain (*Franco*, pp.502, 508-09, 525). The Spanish regime was sensitive to this fact, and sometimes attempted to exploit the differences between the two countries (*Franco*, pp.508, 517-18, 524). It is possible that Spain, in turn, felt less disposed to strike a conciliatory stance with the United States than with Britain.

However, it seems that the very fact of the greater hostility towards Franco on the part of the United States, along with that country's economic and political might, meant that Spanish efforts to placate the larger power were especially strenuous once the war had turned against the Axis: newspapers were explicitly instructed, in August 1944, to favour the United States in their reporting of the Americans' war against Japan (Gubern, p.55), and Franco made great efforts to flatter Carlton Hayes and his successor, Norman Armour with diplomatic gestures (*Franco*, pp.524-25).

Whilst it is unlikely that this attempt to curry favour with America, which Franco regarded as 'a hotbed of dangerous freemasonry' (*Franco*, p.525), was directly reflected in such an invisible area of government as book censorship, it is worth noting the regime's growing sensitivity to American power from the end of the war onwards.



Relations with the United States became an increasingly crucial consideration for the regime in later years, as will become apparent below.

*A schism, which appeared in 1941 and widened as time passed, can be perceived between the ever-improving status of British culture, promoted by Starkie, and the continuing resentment towards Britain in political terms for its supposedly antagonistic role in the Civil War and the early part of the Second World War. We might thus tentatively speculate that publishers may have responded to the ascendancy of British culture by publishing greater numbers of translations from English. We might expect this increase in English translations to be countered initially by stringent censorship, as the Falange-dominated political regime remained antagonistic to England and the values it allegedly represented. From 1943 or 1944 onwards, we might expect a somewhat more liberal attitude to have evolved with respect to translated English books, as the regime saw the expediency of conciliation with the Allied countries.*

*Antipathy towards American culture, similarly, is likely to have softened as the Allied victory became inevitable. The relative lack of historical and cultural links between Spain and the United States, and the absence of an active cultural mission to compare with Starkie's British Institute, suggest that a popular upsurge of pro-American feeling is unlikely to have taken place, however. Translations of American works are unlikely to have been made in increased numbers, therefore, though some liberalization of censorship towards the end of the war is a likely consequence of the regime's overall ideological realignment.*

## (ii) Post-War Isolation

The process of regrouping and international stocktaking immediately after the war, however, did not favour closer ties between Spain and Britain or the United States. Spain was forced into almost total isolation by, firstly, the explicit denunciation of the regime by the nations attending the San Francisco conference which effectively launched the United Nations in June 1945. This condemnation was reiterated in a declaration made at the Potsdam Conference on 2 August 1945, and again in March 1946, in the Tripartite Declaration signed by the historic enemies France, England and the United States.<sup>25</sup>

The Caudillo, despite the widespread shortage of food, fuel and building materials, remained convinced that autarky was a feasible economic strategy. His response to international criticism took the form of supercilious harangues against the 'masonic super State' (the United States), and audacious justifications of his equivocal role in the Second World War (*Franco*, pp.549-50). The relationship between Spain and the United States, particularly, was soon to change radically, however, as we shall see in the following section.

*Once again assuming a simplistically direct correspondence between external political relations and the response to foreign culture, we might expect the mid- to late 1940s to be characterized by stringently applied censorship criteria with respect to books translated from English, reflecting the regime's posture of defiant isolationism in the face of international opprobrium.*

### (iii) Cold War Reconciliation

By the end of the 1940s it was clear that autarky was unsustainable and that Franco would have to convince leaders other than his natural allies Salazar and Perón that Spain was an acceptable trading partner. Conveniently for the regime, the invasion of Czechoslovakia and the Berlin blockade in 1948 had triggered Western, and particularly American hysteria concerning Soviet plans for global conquest.<sup>26</sup> From the onset of the 'Cold War', Washington quickly moved to make peace with Spain, which offered a rabidly anti-communist regime and, above all, a strategically advantageous geographical situation as trading incentives.

The outside world's overtures to Franco, in the form of bank loans from the United States in 1949 and 1950, and the resumption of full diplomatic contact in the latter year (ambassadors had been withdrawn in December 1946), culminated in the *Pacto de Madrid* of September 1953, which established a long-term North American military presence on Spanish soil in exchange for a 226 million dollar aid package. The regime's rapprochement with the outside world was further consolidated by Spain's entry into the United Nations in 1955, and by the concession of further loans by American banks in the late 1950s.

It is important to point out, however, that in the early stages of the conciliation era, between 1947 and 1951, relations between Spain and Britain were far less cordial

than those between Spain and the United States. The Labour government was far less preoccupied with the supposed Sino-Soviet communist threat than the State Department of the early McCarthy era. Both Britain and France therefore initially opposed accepting the regime, a situation which led to occasional confrontation on the matter between Spain's historic European enemies and the emergent superpower whose favour the Caudillo had begun to court. Franco energetically played up Anglo-American differences of approach when it suited him, and anti-British sentiments were frequently expressed by the regime in this era, often by the Caudillo himself (*Franco*, pp.574-616).

American aid was undoubtedly a crucial factor in the ultimate success of the *Plan de Estabilización* implemented in 1959. In this year, Franco's pro-American sentiments reached their zenith when Eisenhower paid an official visit. Preston reports that 'the Caudillo [...] was completely captivated, talking about nothing else for weeks on end' (*Franco* p.681). A change of direction in Franco's internal policy, however, also facilitated the economic upsurge desperately required after the crippling years of autarky: the nomination to the cabinet of Opus Dei technocrats in 1957 marked the end of the Falange's domination of power and patronage at Franco's court, and subtly but crucially altered the character of his government from then on.

Although the technocrats could hardly be described as liberal revisionists, given their adherence to the ultra-conservative Opus Dei, within the spectrum of opinion allowable under Franco they were comparatively progressive and pragmatic. Their attitudes to foreign culture were correspondingly somewhat more sympathetic than those of the fanatically patriotic stalwarts of the Falange.

*We might thus expect a steady tempering of attitudes towards foreign children's books generally throughout the 1950s, provoked by the necessity of liberalizing, at least cosmetically, in order to favour political and therefore economic contact with Europe and, especially, the United States.*

#### (iv) Schizophrenia: Mid-1960s to 1975

The rise of the technocrats also set in motion a dialectic which was to characterize Francoism from the early 1960s until the Caudillo's death, however: pragmatic moves towards liberalization, necessary to placate the increasingly troublesome populace and

the regime's foreign sponsors, were followed by demonstrations of the regime's repressive might, used to avert the threat of a reactionary coup by outraged sections of the old guard who still held sway in the military.

The dialectical pattern of grudging liberalization followed by compensatory reaction complicates the task of charting the regime's latter ideological evolution, since either of the two tendencies might be in the ascendancy in a given area of policy at any particular time, depending on the balance of power in individual ministries and the impact of specific events on each locus of power.

Within this complex parallel evolution, the factor which perhaps most affects censorship is the identity of the Minister of Information and Tourism, who was directly responsible for the implementation of the censorship laws. The evolution of this ministry, and its possible effect on the censorship of specific books, is dealt with in greater detail in Chapter 2. Suffice to say here that the most significant event in that evolution in the post-1957 period was the nomination of Manuel Fraga Iribarne as *Ministro de Información y Turismo* in 1962, and the enactment by Fraga of the new *Ley de Prensa e Imprenta* of 1966 (popularly known as the 'Ley Fraga'). This legislation purported to be a thoroughgoing reform of the anachronistic censorship laws, but it is now generally agreed that it was a cosmetic exercise which stopped far short of implanting genuine freedom of expression (see p.63, below).

With regard to the wider political picture, it is relevant to identify here particularly reactionary periods in the later Francoist trajectory, since these may bear on the strictness with which the censorship laws are applied. Francoist propaganda films of the mid- to late 1960s show an economically thriving nation playing genial host to the vast numbers of visitors to the intensively developed coastal regions. These benevolent images disguise the student unrest which became an increasing irritant to the regime throughout the period, and conveniently ignore the cooling of relations with Britain, provoked in 1965-6 by Spain's reiterated claims to sovereignty over Gibraltar.

The tendency towards repressive reaction to such problems became more marked as the hardline but nominally technocratic figure of Luis Carrero Blanco rose to prominence, first with his promotion to the position of *Subsecretario de la Presidencia* in 1965 and then to that of *Vicepresidente del Gobierno* in 1967.

In 1969, growing student and worker unrest provoked a drastic clampdown by Carrero, who declared a national 'state of exception' in January. This extended the suspension of constitutional guarantees and implantation of special police powers which had already been established in the Basque country in the previous year. From 1969 until the Admiral's assassination in late 1973, both Franco's and Carrero's rhetoric and responses to internal unrest reflect an increasingly desperate willingness to resort to repression in the face of the growing threat of ETA and worker and student protest.

Carrero's successor as President of the Government, Carlos Arias Navarro, inherited an impossible situation. The regime's contradictory forces were now waging open war on each other: as workers, students and priests continued to campaign for a decisive shift towards democracy, so the ultras, headed by the fanatical Blas Piñar and the hardline generals, were planning purges of the military to extirpate liberal elements, and orchestrating attacks on liberal priests, lawyers and bookshops in an attempt to stem the popular tide. As a result, the final phase of the regime was marked by ambivalent, sometimes contradictory appointments and pronouncements by the new President, causing Paul Preston to refer to 'the ambiguity, not to say schizophrenia' of Arias's period in office.

*During the mid-1960s, it is probable that the trend towards liberalization continued as tourism boomed and cosmetic reform continued to be necessary in order to favour trade relations. The reactionary backlash began to gather momentum in this phase, however, and possibly signalled the beginning of a period of fluctuating rigour in the application of censorship laws.*

*Given that regressive forces rise to the fore somewhat towards the end of the 1960s and in particular at the beginning of the 1970s, we might expect to detect a possible return to xenophobic intransigence in censorship practice as the reascendant 'ultra' faction of the regime defiantly, if desperately, stood firm in the face of international pressure.*

*In the period between the assassination of Carrero Blanco and the death of Franco, that of Arias Navarro's presidency, it is difficult to predict the evolution of censorship practice, since the prevailing character of the regime itself had become so ambiguous. Suffice to say here that the ideology which the Francoist censorship*

*apparatus had been established to defend was now so compromised that a coherent approach to censorship practice had become impossible.*

### **Part III: Literature, Children's Sexuality and Gender Roles**

In order to comprehend the importance of sexuality and gender in the context of children's literature censorship, the peculiar significance of sexual repression and gender stereotyping in the overall Francoist ideological scheme must be pointed up. Although Francoism was no different from other authoritarian regimes in using sexual repression as an instrument of control, its relative importance in the ideological scheme may well have been greater in the Francoist case than in other comparable regimes. This is because the repression of sexuality emanated not only from the fascistic embargo on self-gratification, but also directly from the Catholic Church. The particular characteristics of Francoist sexual repression, and its peculiar ferocity, are largely attributable to the influence of the Church, which still commanded instinctive respect in much of the populace of a traditionally devout nation. This respect ensured that the Church was a vital force in a movement whose political component, the Falange, had never commanded mass support on the scale of the Nazis and the Italian Fascists (see Schapiro's definition in note 5).

Franco was fully aware that the Church needed placating after the years of persecution it had suffered under the Republic, and that it was due substantial reward for its support during the Civil War.<sup>27</sup> The Caudillo's solution was to return to the Church almost complete control over education, whose secularization was viewed by the Nationalists as one of the great outrages of the Republican era. In accordance with the general process of polarization along the liberal/reactionary axis which had culminated in the Civil War, the Church of early Francoist Spain espoused a Catholicism of the most retrograde and fundamentalist hue.<sup>28</sup> The inculcation of sexual repression was thus a conscious goal and an inevitable consequence of the Francoist education system.

The significance of the preeminent Catholic component of sexual repression lies in its particularly misogynistic character: the woman was set up as the site of 'natural' purity and chastity, alongside a male who was the victim of irrepressible urges. It was thus the honest woman's duty to save the man from sexuality, viewed as

a diabolical temptation or snare, by manifesting her absolute lack of interest in carnal contact at all times.

Juan Ruíz Rico, in his revealing analysis of court case summaries, cites numerous allusions by judges to the woman's 'natural pudor', 'natural resistencia' and 'connaturales pudor, decoro y decencia'.<sup>29</sup> If a woman succumbed to the 'torpes apetitos' of the male, it was generally because she was weak or mentally unstable, as Ruíz Rico's characterization of the Francoist conception of woman suggests: 'mansa y obediente, carente por completo de apetitos sexuales, físicamente débil y fragilísimo de mente' (p.60).

Occasionally, however, it was recognised that some women's relatively free expression of sexual identity was wilful. In an odd lexical irony, given the regime's promotion of 'alegría' as a positive quality in children, such women were stigmatized with the label 'mujer de vida alegre'. Sexual promiscuity itself was not the only criterion for membership of this category; women who frequented establishments selling alcohol, and particularly those where dancing took place, were assumed to be 'frivolous' (Ruíz Rico, pp.145, 189-94).

This prohibition on free social interaction for women, and the demonizing of social activities which facilitated contact between the sexes, in part reflected the terror surrounding threats to the family, the hierarchical unit which formed the foundation of the Francoist social edifice. Subjugation of women was felt necessary in order to shore up the institution of marriage, a fact reflected in the legislation of the era: until 1958 it was illegal for a Spanish woman to leave home unless it was to marry or become a nun (Ruíz, p.23).

The inculcation of gender roles naturally began at school level: in accordance with the principles of National-Catholicism, desecularization of education was accompanied by the immediate and total reversal of the Republican plan to implant coeducation, a process which had been initiated only in the province of Madrid before it was paralysed by the Civil War.<sup>30</sup> The subservient role ascribed to women in the new segregatory educational regime was proclaimed, in similar fashion to declarations concerning the role of the poor, as if it were a natural state of affairs: 'En las escuelas de niñas brillará la femineidad más rotunda, procurando las maestras, con labores y enseñanzas apropiadas al hogar, dar carácter a sus escuelas, tendiendo a una

contribución práctica en favor de nuestro ejército'.<sup>31</sup> The belief in 'natural' differences between the sexes which underlies this segregated educational regime is faithfully reflected in the *Bibliografía Hispánica* articles on child reading habits, as the following example from the first such article, by J. Lasso de la Vega, demonstrates:

Las niñas, en su primera edad, suelen mostrar una clara preferencia por los libros de hadas. Gustan también de las historias de animales y de escenas domésticas, si bien imaginativamente y con intervenciones sobrenaturales.

Viene después, como en el niño, un período difícil entre los once y doce años, en que la niña se torna sumamente sensible a la crítica del traje, del pelo, el andar o sus maneras o modales, cuando ya desea ser bella, simpática y querida de los miembros de su familia, profesores y amigos.<sup>32</sup>

Later, the author ostensibly advises against rigid ascription of gender roles: 'prácticamente se ha de huir de diferenciar mucho las lecturas propias del niño y de la niña, y sí únicamente tener en cuenta la diferencia de sus temperamentos para guiarlos convenientemente' (p.12). The recommended solution, however, is merely to expose boys to a small number of 'girls' texts and vice versa:

Por ser la niña más sensible y más propensa a la vida imaginativa, gusta más de la poesía y del drama. La niña, como el niño, procura visiones de la vida, si bien por diferentes caminos. Ellas necesitan leer libros de acción, de aventuras, propios de muchachos, donde se aborden empresas heroicas y desinteresadas, desprovistos de toda clase de análisis psicológicos, en los que haya necesidad de sortear graves peligros y derrochar arrestos y valentía, para mantenerlas alejadas de una tendencia natural hacia la introspección, demasiado intensa y perniciosa. Por la razón inversa, el niño necesita, a su vez, leer libros de ligeras tramas psicológicas, para despertar en ellos una cierta introspección y suscitar en su alma finas emociones y sentimientos delicados. (pp.11-12)

Since all permissible works in this context inscribe one kind of gender stereotype or another, this is hardly a radical counterbalance to the highly discriminatory gender paradigm expounded throughout the article. Indeed, beneath the analytically 'progressive' veneer of the article generally, the conception of the child is tailored to the highly traditional model of the Francoist adult, according to which the male is required to be technically competent and unreflective, whilst the woman remains, conversely, the repository of spiritual and natural mystery:

Por ser los niños más objetivos y reaccionar más rápidamente ante cualquier influencia, resulta mucho más fácil trabajar con ellos que con la niñas, siempre más reservadas y menos fáciles de conducir. Ruskin decía: 'se puede construir con un muchacho alguna cosa; las muchachas, en cambio, despiertan solas, como las flores'. (p.12)



Having defined appropriate reading material in general terms according to these stereotypes, the author then proposes a reading chronology for the developing child. According to this scheme, children should read fairy-tales from the age of six to the age of nine, after which they begin to manifest an interest in the real world: '(El niño) comienza a interesarse por la vida real. Esta es la edad de oro para llevar al niño a la lectura de los hechos y ponerle en relación con la vida real' (p.12). However, the 'hechos' to which the child can now be safely exposed have nothing to do with the social realities of its own 'vida real': 'en esta edad seducen las lecturas de libros sobre aventuras, especialmente las llamadas de "Boy-scouts" o exploradores'. The scenarios and characters of the genre which is advocated to acquaint boys with 'reality', adventure stories, are only more real than those of fairy stories in the sense that they are not supernatural. Such stories are often implicitly imperialist in character, narrating the exploits of swash-buckling heroes or intrepid navigators, sometimes appropriately described as 'larger than life' characters. The relationship of such tales to the real life of a child in the devastated Spain of the 1940s and 1950s is clearly less direct than Lasso de la Vega seems to imply.

The orthodox attitude to the pedagogic function of books begins to emerge here, for despite the author's explicit assertion that interest in the adventure genre represents an evolution towards realism in the child's reading tastes, there is perhaps a tacit recognition, in the use of the verb 'seducir', that the genre is essentially escapist. As will become evident below, behind orthodox advocations of 'reality' as a necessary element of certain children's books, there is always an implicit recognition that reality is in fact the last thing to which children should be exposed.

At ten, boys will reject fairy-tales in favour of 'libros de viajes, usos y costumbres' and 'biografías cortas y sencillas de personajes míticos y legendarios, Mio Cid, Rey Arturo...' (p.13). Eleven sees the first stirrings of sexual awareness, and therefore the beginnings of the most perilous phase of development:

A los once, el niño lee los libros que ordinariamente se designan como libros infantiles. Este es, sin duda alguna, el momento más peligroso. Esta es la edad en que buscan los libros de aventura y misterio, en que el sexo, por otra parte, comienza a despertar y a diferenciarlos. Las niñas leen con el máximo interés las primeras lecturas amorosas, y hay que cuidar mucho esta lectura, para que no se convierta en ellas en una pasión absorbente. (p.13)

The fear that the child risked being corrupted by literature, implicit in all three articles discussed here, was based on two fundamental orthodox precepts: the conviction that literature was inherently corrupting, and the belief that the child was innately corruptible. The dangers of allowing the weak young spirit to become absorbed in the deceptive temptations of the text are repeatedly articulated in morality manuals of the era:

La lectura de novelas, sobre todo si son inmorales, tienen un halago irresistible para los bajos instintos de la carne. El corazón juvenil, naturalmente inclinado a la maldad, a la sensualidad, encuentra en esas lecturas el logro de sus abyectas aspiraciones. Ahí tenéis, pues, sepultado al joven en un inmundo lodazal del que con dificultad podrá salir.<sup>33</sup>

In the case of the young man, Lasso de la Vega's article advises that the awakening libido should be sublimated by continued exposure to texts featuring imperialist warriors and their deeds: 'Es la edad de leer con no igualado entusiasmo las vidas del Gran Capitán, Alejandro Magno, Napoleón, Hernán Cortés, Pizarro, Orellana, Valdivia, etc....'. Lasso de la Vega also advocates purely fictional adventure stories as an effective distraction from base physical urges. As in the previous allusion to the adventure genre, there seems to be an implicit admission, in the epithets used, that such stories are little more than a means of diverting the youth from his incipient pubescence: 'es ésta también la edad en que entusiasma a los muchachos la lectura de aventuras peligrosas y sensacionales' (p.13).

In case the masculine exuberance of the protagonists of such works should provoke an unproductive restlessness in the male child, a tempering dose of religious teaching should be incorporated into his reading: 'Es también buena edad para la lectura de la Historia Sagrada y de las vidas de los personajes bíblicos' (p.13).

At thirteen, the child's reading matter should continue to reflect the respective characteristics of the sexes: the realm of the objective, the rational and the factual for the male, and that of the subjective, the spiritual and the sentimental for the female: 'El niño lee libros sobre descubrimientos científicos con interés, y las niñas hacen sus primeras exploraciones en el mundo de las emociones y sentimientos de los adultos' (p.13).

During this crucial transitional phase between childhood and adulthood, the author stresses, nothing less than the child's future is at stake, for there is a direct

relationship between literary consumption and personal evolution: 'De la naturaleza de las lecturas que en esta edad se le proporcionen, honestas o peligrosas, dependen en alto grado no sólo sus gustos literarios futuros, sino lo que es aun más importante: su desarrollo y su vida' (p.13).

The corrupting power of literature is again alluded to with respect to the temptations experienced by the fifteen-year-old reader: 'Es edad en que ciertos espíritus se ven poderosamente atraídos hacia la lectura de obras policíacas y de novelas románticas. Las muchachas buscan especialmente estas últimas. Edad muy peligrosa, en la que la lectura debe cuidarse mucho para no deformar toda una psicología' (p.14).

Once again, the antidote in cases of over-exposure to such noxious products, at least in the case of the boy, is a healthy dose of adventure, a less sordid and therefore more acceptable form of escapism than the *novela policíaca*: 'En este sentido, es más fácil corregir al muchacho que a las chicas, por la mayor propensión de aquellos a sentir interés por la literatura de los descubrimientos, viajes, etc.' (p.14).

Finally, Lasso de la Vega's prescription repeats the advocacy of a movement from an initial phase in which the child's interest in reading itself is secured by exposure to diverting fictional or fantastical stories, towards a formative phase in which the child should be encouraged to digest factual biographies. The specific examples he uses suggest that foreign classics are tolerated and even encouraged in the early phase, but that the focus should become exclusively patriotic in the latter phase:

El punto de partida del niño debe ser siempre su propio interés en la vida: aquello que le ha interesado más vivamente. De esta lectura debe pasar a otra que, conservando una fase de este interés, tenga otras zonas más beneficiosas para su formación, y en la tercera debe producirse un análogo desarrollo. Así, por ejemplo, se puede pasar de un libro de piratas de Salgari, *Sandokan*, a un libro de Julio Verne, y de éste a un viaje de Sven Hedin, y, a su vez, de éste a las biografías de Hernán Cortés, F. Pizarro, Grijalva, y de estos ya a la de Isabel la Católica, Carlos V, etc.. (p.14)

The second article discussed here, which appeared in May of the following year (1946) reveals further evidence of a shallow endorsement of realism in children's literature, beneath which lies an evident desire to prevent children from contemplating reality, ostensibly to protect their sensibilities.<sup>34</sup>

The first subsection of the piece, by Francisco Cervera y Jiménez Alfaro, concerns editions of works by classic authors. With regard to literary and historical classics, Cervera establishes a threshold age of twelve years. Children under twelve should be limited to consumption of abridged works of literature, and history books should be avoided altogether. Cervera thus reveals once again the ostensible advocacy of a movement from the fantastic to the real. He points out that there are important nuances in such a movement, however: the child is, of course, correct in its belief in the supernatural world, as distinct from its ingenuously erroneous belief in the magical: 'el pequeño que va a leer a los literatos o a los historiadores sabe que existe, además del mundo real, el mundo sobrenatural, y cree también que puede existir un mundo fantástico o mágico' (p.286).

The development of patriotic feeling, through study of appropriately selected historical texts, should therefore be left until the child is thought properly capable of ratiocination:

Pero el descubrimiento de una realidad pasada, concreta, y que influye sobre la época actual, el darse cuenta de que existen la historia, la tradición y la cultura, es obra de la edad en la que ya se razona. La austera hermosura de la verdad no es para ser contemplada cara a cara por inteligencias infantiles. (p.286)

Once again, it is evident that the notion of protecting - or prohibiting - children from the knowledge of a harsh reality underlies the orthodox attitude to children's reading: it turns out that even the 'verdad' to which older children can be productively exposed is heavily circumscribed. The permissible truth is entirely subordinated, naturally, to Catholic morality.<sup>35</sup> The 'truth' is also rigorously confined to the past: at no stage is it recommended that children should read any work relating to the present epoch. Furthermore, as with Lasso de la Vega's recommendations for older children, the focus is relentlessly parochial. Consider, for example, the following complaint about the repetitiousness of subject matter in the field of historical biography: 'Se les ha contado veinte veces a los niños la vida de Colón, y ninguna de Roger de Lauria; para las niñas se ha relatado con frecuencia la vida de la gran Reina Isabel, y figuras tan delicadas como la de Isabel Clara Eugenia permanecen inéditas para el mundillo juvenil' (p.288).

The historical biography section reveals further evidence of a disingenuous advocacy of realism, ostensibly in the service of pedagogic rigour, in the form of an apparent exhortation to be uncompromising in the presentation of the truth: 'urge, pues, renovar los personajes en las colecciones de biografías infantiles y tener en cuenta que, si el protagonista no estuvo exento de grandes defectos morales, se desfigura la historia si se ocultan éstos' (p.288).

In fact, this turns about to be a piece of censorship advice, urging adaptors to expurgate with subtlety. The author continues: 'o resultará un libro poco adecuado para niños si se narran aventuras más o menos escabrosas. El tacto y el buen sentido, así moral como técnico, deben buscar una prudente línea media' (p.288).

A disparity between a 'truth' permissible for children and the unacceptable truth is revealed in two other instances in the article. In the final section, on 'asuntos históricos', the author comments revealingly on the relationship of the child to the real world: '¿Y la novela histórica para niños? ¿Por qué no unir poesía y verdad para los pequeños lectores, que todavía no se han desprendido, *por fortuna para ellos*, de su mundo de ensueños' (my emphasis, p.288). The orthodox notion of childhood as an illusory refuge from the hardships of real life is evident once again in the author's weary aside (italicized).

The final element which lays bare the shallowness of the apparent advocacy of realism is the author's defence of the chivalric romance as a mode suitable for children. The benefits to be derived from promotion of the genre as children's literature are explicitly ideological: 'Un filón, casi inédito, de literatura para niños y adolescentes son los libros de caballerías, que, siendo tan dañosos para los hidalgos del siglo dieciséis, bien pueden hoy sembrar sentimientos elevados y nobles, que contrarrestarían el materialismo burgués y agarbanzado de la época actual' (p.288).

This amounts to an admission that the child's reading, far from achieving the ostensible goal of bringing him into contact with reality, should perform rather the opposite function, that of making the child less worldly.

The ostensible advocacy of realism is also apparent in the final article on bibliography for children, which also returns us to the Francoist conception of the feminine.<sup>36</sup> Curiously, in the light of Cervera's final recommendation, the author, Carolina Toral, begins her article by quoting Saint Teresa's confession of her addiction

to the romance, remarking that this confession should be sufficient to demonstrate the potential dangers of placing the wrong sort of books in the hands of the young.

This suggests a contradiction: Cervera wholeheartedly advocates the romance for children, whereas Toral seems to condemn it. The contradiction is only apparent, however: Cervera is undoubtedly referring to the male reader, who as we know from the first article, was thought to require a corrective dose of spirituality to combat his 'natural' pragmatism; in this article Toral addresses the specific question of reading matter for girls, conversely thought to be constitutionally prone to an unhealthy preoccupation with the romantic.

After indirectly advising against the romance for girls, however, Toral then warns against the opposite error of supplying them with aridly indigestible material. In terms which are by now familiar, her explanation acknowledges the seductive capacity of literature, its efficiency as a means of effortless indoctrination:

Pero hay que tener sumo cuidado en no dar a las niñas, para su solaz, obras exclusivamente formativas; conviene tener en cuenta que la amenidad y el interés son imprescindibles para ir recibiendo, casi inconscientemente, una formación espiritual con las lecturas consentidas en las horas de recreo, sin exponernos a que dejen el libro aburridas, pensando que es una lección más. (p.455)

In a fashion we can also now regard as typical, Toral bases her prescriptions throughout the article on the degree of reality, in her judgement, embodied in the work or genre in question. She establishes that by age sixteen, the young female reader requires a certain weight of verisimilitude to anchor the fictional work in the world that she knows, for the purposes of identification: 'quiere lecturas que unan a la fantasía una realidad que la permita en ocasiones, creerse ella misma una protagonista' (p.456). Toral then launches into a ferocious attack on the *novela rosa*. What is dangerous about the genre, in her view, is the received opinion that it is morally sound, despite the fact that it distorts reality:

Hay que evitar cuidadosamente el peligro de la novela rosa, de la llamada 'novela moral', que no carece de inmoralidad; parece que preocupados por una sólo y única clase de moral, se da de lado el peligro que hay en estas obras, en las que todo es irreal y, por tanto, desenfocan la vida. (p.456)

As Nichols has pointed out (p.216), the particular generic characteristic which Toral feels to be dangerously escapist is the protagonist's capacity to overcome class

hierarchy and achieve happiness by attracting, on the basis of personal merit, the love of a man above her station:

Las heroínas, generalmente bellas, piadosas y pobres (casi todas institutrices), logran, después de grandes sufrimientos, convertir a las familias entre las que habitan y ser elegidas entre todas por sus bellas cualidades; esto, ¡tan bonito, pero tan falso! tiene el peligro de deformar las imaginaciones juveniles y hacerlas vivir un poco en la ... luna, y que sea para ellas mucho más penosa la realidad con que, más pronto o más tarde, tienen necesariamente que enfrentarse. (p.456)

Again there is an insistence on childhood as a temporary refuge from harsh reality, in which poverty is a divinely bestowed and inescapable condition: the poor can expect 'grandes sufrimientos', but they should not hope for terrestrial reward.

Significantly, Toral then qualifies her overall rejection of the *novela rosa*, conceding that examples by certain French exponents of the genre are acceptable because they are written 'con sentido moral y religioso'. Another group, 'formado en su mayoría por autoras inglesas, norteamericanas, y algunas alemanas, todas modernas' is completely unacceptable, on the other hand, because 'carecen completamente de espíritu religioso-moral' and 'es tan distinto de los nuestros el ambiente, costumbres y relaciones entre ambos sexos, que resultan completamente inadmisibles para niñas españolas' (p.456). Toral again alludes to the dangerous plausibility of literature with reference to Northern European *novelas rosas*: 'Tienen estas novelas el peligroso arte de presentar las cosas prohibidas dentro de la moral tan sencillas, corrientes y naturales, que las niñas piensan que no hay en ello mal alguno' (p.457).

The distinction Toral makes here might imply that the hierarchy of allies and enemies of Spain discussed above (pp.21-24) may not map directly onto the area of culture, for there is a suggestion here that it is the alien Anglo-Saxon or Germanic character which makes English, American and German novels unacceptable, whilst it is the supposedly common, Latin conventions, both literary and social, which make French novels acceptable.

It becomes clear later in the article that it is principally the religious question which determines whether an author is fully orthodox or not: it is the common ground of Catholicism which allows Toral wholeheartedly to recommend the French authors. It is thus evident that the regime was capable of taking a somewhat more nuanced approach to foreign literary texts than one might have surmised on the evidence of the

simplistic national stereotypes to be found in school textbooks: despite the abhorrence of France because of the Enlightenment, the fact that it was at least *traditionally* Catholic was felt to betoken a certain spiritual proximity to Spain. Conversely, the specifically Protestant identity of the Anglo-Saxon authors is mentioned as a reservation, despite the fact that the authors' writings generally accord with the orthodox spirit: 'aunque escriben con un sentido sano y moral, tienen el inconveniente de desarrollar sus temas y relatos en ambientes protestantes' (p.463).

The general notion of Northern Europe, and specifically England, as a different, alien location, aside from the religious question, is evident in Toral's pointing up of the exotic and stereotypical features (as she perceives them) of two works by Dickens: '*El cántico de Navidad*, impregnado de extraña poesía nortea; *La guinea de la coja*, cuento genuinamente inglés, con nieblas y castillos, "nurseries" y monedas de oro' (p.462).

Returning to her appraisal of the *novela rosa*, Toral's reasons for dismissing the novels she rejects reveal her initial complaint concerning their lack of reality to be disingenuous: it is their failure to reflect the National-Catholic *interpretation* of reality which makes them unacceptable. As in previous prescriptions, Toral's notion of the 'reality' to which children can be exposed, through literature, is a highly circumscribed *permissible* reality:

Al hablar de novelas 'reales', quiero significar el relato de hechos que puedan existir, que quizá si nos paramos un poco a reflexionar vemos a nuestro alrededor todos los días; personajes, temas y escenarios bellos. No quiero referirme a quienes retratan la vida con toda su deplorable grosería vista a la luz del crudo materialismo moderno ... Eso es lo que deben hacer autores, editores o por lo menos seleccionadores de bibliotecas y lecturas: lo malo, lo feo existe, como también existe lo bello, lo puro, que es a lo que debemos dirigir siempre nuestras miradas; y más aún en este caso en que se trata de algo tan serio, tan importante, como formar conciencias juveniles. (p.457)

The conflation of aesthetic and moral considerations, common in Francoist discourse, is evident here: the ugly and the evil are here being equated, or at least considered as comparable ills ('lo malo, lo feo existe...'). Reality is plagued with the spiritually and physically unlovely, but we should simply look the other way ('también existe lo bello, lo puro, que es a lo que debemos dirigir siempre nuestras miradas').

Purity and beauty are particularly important characteristics in literature for girls, since these are the qualities the girls themselves should strive to cultivate, as is



demonstrated by Toral's choice of the ideal role model: 'Debe tener un puesto de honor en la Biblioteca de estas niñas la *Vida de la Virgen María*, como ejemplo cuya pura belleza debe querer y tratar de imitar toda jovencita' (p.458).

The emphasis on piety and purity is relentless throughout the rest of Toral's article. She principally recommends biographies of Saints in which 'la pureza forma su principal aureola' (p.458), and even in her 'sección recreativa', a female French author is chosen because she is 'eminentemente católica', and because one of her works 'une el hilo de oro de la fantasía con el más puro de los amores' (p.461). Both the denial of female sexuality and the promotion of austerity are evident in Toral's emphasis on the qualities which make the Saints she has chosen particularly worthy of emulation: 'Santa Inés, lirio entre los lirios, haciendo honor a su nombre griego "agnos" que significa casta, pura, y de quien San Dámaso dijera "que era la gloria santa del pudor". [...] Santa Teresita del Niño Jesús, con su cuerpo tan frágil y su alma tan ardiente, tan pura tan misionera, tan silenciosamente entregada al lento martirio de cada hora [...]' (pp.458-59). Other orthodox characteristics, already discussed in earlier sections, are also in evidence: a particular work is recommended because it is 'enfocada en un ambiente de sano optimismo y de moral religiosa'.

Toral's final remarks take the form of a patriotic rallying call to potential authors of books for girls. This rallying call confirms the preeminence of purity in the orthodox attitude to such books: 'hacen falta autores, cuantos más mejor, que sepan unir a la inspiración novelística la fuerza inmensa, la gran pureza del ideal católico' (p.463).

## Conclusion

*From these prescriptions, we can extend the prescription of the model Francoist child begun in Part I, adding that the male child specifically should be objective, analytical, preferably technically competent, knowledgeable of permissible areas of history (though not the present), and extrovert. Furthermore, we can adumbrate a prototype Francoist girl, who through her reading was encouraged to be introverted, delicate, spiritual, and enigmatic. It was regarded as natural and necessary that children of both sexes should have no visible sexuality. It can be assumed that literature for children which did not tend to promote these stereotypes may have met with the regime's disapproval.*

*Certain types of literature were felt to be especially efficient in moulding this ideal drone and his ethereal spouse: tales of adventure and discovery and, later, scientific treatises for the former; fairy-tales and the most chaste and anodyne romantic novels for the latter; and religious and historical biography (of carefully chosen figures) for both.*

*Generally, the fear of moral corruption through excessive indulgence in the wrong sort of reading is the dominant note of the Francoist attitude to children's books. In a way which reflects the antagonism to frivolity and irony discussed above (pp.15-16), sobriety and gravity are considered increasingly necessary as the child gets older. No books are recommended on the basis that they might make children laugh, and the age when the child supposedly risks being somehow sensually implicated, actually absorbed in the text, is considered the most dangerous.*

*The prescriptions thus ostensibly advocate a movement from trivial childish fantasy to the solid realism of adulthood. In fact, the 'reality' which the regime wished to see reflected in books for young people was strictly determined by the dogma of National-Catholicism. The prescriptions thus reinforce the inference arrived at in Part I that books which manifest frivolity, irony or mischief are likely to have been regarded with suspicion by the censors.*

*Finally, with regard to Francoist attitudes to children's literature, it is clear that children's books written in Protestant countries, especially those in which the relationship between the sexes is portrayed, were regarded with a certain suspicion, and that the difference in character and customs, evident in a more diffuse fashion in such works, was also a source of unease.*

*Both the William books and Tom Sawyer transgress the Francoist prescriptions for children's books on various counts, most obviously because they contain or exalt irony, nonconformism and juvenile sexuality.<sup>37</sup> It should nonetheless be noted that both William and Tom are extrovert, technically competent and analytical in certain circumstances, as well as generally optimistic. Similarly, William's admirer Joan and Tom's girlfriend Becky in many instances fit the notion of the submissive, enigmatic girl which underlies Francoist prescriptions for children's books. On the other hand, Becky is also a conscious flirt, and William is frequently*

*to be found in the company of female characters who could hardly conform less to the Francoist model of femininity.*

*The implications of these particular features of the principal works are dealt with in detail in the thematic chapters (4 to 7). Here, it is sufficient to remark that both Tom Sawyer and the William books are somewhat ambivalent with regard to their degree of conformity to the Francoist models of the child and children's literature. In order to understand further the regime's response to these works, the peculiar norms of the Francoist censorship apparatus and its functioning must be analysed. The following two chapters describe these norms (Chapter 2), and their specific application to the principal works (Chapter 3).*

## NOTES:

1. *On the Genealogy of Morals*, (New York: Random House, 1969), p.12.
2. Geraldine Cleary Nichols, 'Children's Literature in Spain (1939-1950): Ideology and Practice', in *Fascismo y experiencia literaria: Reflexiones para una recanonización*, ed. by Hernán Vidal (Minneapolis: Society for the Study of Contemporary Hispanic and Lusophone Revolutionary Literatures, 1985), pp.213-21 (p.213).
3. Mark Twain (pseud. of Samuel Langhorne Clemens), *Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn* (Ware: Wordsworth, 1992). Hereafter the abbreviated forms *Tom Sawyer* and *Huck Finn* will be used as appropriate. *Tom Sawyer* was first published as *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* (London: Chatto and Windus, 1876). Full references for individual *William* books are given where relevant in the course of the present dissertation.
4. Jacobo Muñoz, 'El franquismo: un fascismo a la española', *Cuadernos de Pedagogía: suplemento no. 3 sobre 'Fascismo y educación'* (September 1976), 4-9 (p.4); all subsequent references to *Cuadernos de Pedagogía* are to this number.
5. Leonard Schapiro, distinguishing between the truly totalitarian regimes and other types of authoritarian government, offers the following assessment of Franco's Spain:

For a short time General Franco found it expedient to use the trappings of Fascist doctrine and the support of the Falange. Once established in power, much of the doctrine was abandoned, and the Falange subjected to Franco's control and deprived of its political influence. Spain emerged as an old-fashioned police state, with little regard for civil liberties, with an openly rigged parliament and widespread corruption. There is little mobilization of enthusiasm, virtually no official ideology - beyond that propagated by the Church - and no utopian or millenary aims (Leonard Schapiro, *Totalitarianism*, London (Pall Mall Press: 1972), p.122).

Some later analysts have chosen to ignore the initial, more 'totalitarian' phase described by Schapiro, as Jacobo Muñoz reports:

Algunos autores prefieren hablar, a propósito del franquismo, de una mera 'situación de hecho', de un puro 'pragmatismo autoritario', de una 'dictadura paternalista' (Duverger) o incluso de un 'pluralismo limitado' (Linz). Los partidarios de esta tesis - entre los que figura algún que otro apologeta de Franco - conciben, en suma, el franquismo como una 'coalición pragmática', producto de una suma de circunstancias y casualidades y bastante ajena a connotaciones y compromisos ideológicos demasiado fuertes (Muñoz, p.8).

Muñoz feels Francoism had more in common with Fascism, at least initially, than such authors acknowledge.
6. Throughout this dissertation, the word 'orthodox' will be used to mean 'pertaining to or typical of National-Catholic ideology and its proponents'.
7. The ingredients of the Francoist ideological melange are succinctly accounted for in Muñoz's description:

El Nuevo Estado se apoyó, como es harto sabido, en la Falange. Grupo que por la escasa potencia de su enraizamiento social - lo que le diferencia, por ejemplo, del caso del Partido Nacional Socialista Obrero Alemán - y por el hecho de que Franco no fuera su líder histórico, se convirtió enseguida en una

organización meramente instrumental, destinada a la manipulación de las masas trabajadoras mediante un discurso supuestamente revolucionario y a la creación del marco ideológico legitimador de los nuevos sindicatos corporativos, garantía de un mejor servicio al 'sagrado' interés nacional. De ahí el rótulo 'nacional-sindicalismo'.

Pero el Nuevo Estado recurrió también - en un proceso ciertamente vacilante y en ocasiones incluso contradictorio - a otras fuentes ideológicas (y, por tanto, socio-políticas): tradicionales e integristas, regeneracionistas prefascistas, monárquicos clásicos y católicos (desde antiguos miembros de la CEDA y Propagandistas de Acción Católica a genuinos ultramontanos). Todo ello fue sintetizado en un magma ideológico recientemente bautizado - con particular acierto - como 'nacional-catolicismo' (Muñoz, p.8).

8. Román Gubern, *La censura: Función política y ordenamiento jurídico bajo el franquismo (1936-1975)* (Barcelona: Península, 1981), p.51.
9. Agustín Serrano de Haro, *España es así*, 4th edn (Madrid: Escuela Española, 1940), p.295-98. Despite the frequent incidence of antisemitic rhetoric in the regime's early propaganda, Francoist schoolbooks also contain a somewhat contradictory racially egalitarian strand, deriving from the notion of Christian fraternity: 'En cada hombre que veamos, sea cual sea su color, hemos de considerar que es un ser semejante a nosotros cuya alma vale la sangre de Jesucristo. [...] El verdadero internacionalismo no es más que la fraternidad cristiana.' (Anon, *Así quiero ser: El niño del Nuevo Estado*, 2nd edn (Burgos: Hijos de Santiago Rodríguez, 1940), pp.132-33; hereafter cited as *Así quiero ser*).
10. *Así quiero ser*, p.17. The same work contains another example of this synthesis: 'Por la religión católica luchó España contra los árabes, los turcos, los judíos, los protestantes, los enciclopedistas masónicos y los marxistas. El alma española es naturalmente católica' (p.8).
11. The child was warned that the energy to work and fight effectively could be dissipated by exposure to a range of dangerous 'stimulants': 'Los excitantes como el café, el tabaco, el alcohol, los periódicos, la política, el cine y el lujo minan y gastan nuestro organismo sin cesar' (José María Salaverría, *El muchacho español* (San Sebastián: Librería Internacional, [1938]), p.43; quoted in Andrés Sopena Monsalve, *El florido pensil* (Barcelona: Crítica, 1994), p.217).
12. Milan Kundera, *The Joke*, trans. by Michael Henry Heim (London: Faber and Faber, 1983), p.23.
13. Agustín Serrano de Haro, *Yo soy español*, 26th edn (Madrid: Escuela Española, 1966), p.71. Another example appears in *Así quiero ser*, pp.135-37, in a section entitled 'El deber de trabajar': 'Todo el mundo tiene la obligación de trabajar, y quien pudiendo hacerlo no lo hace, merece el destierro a un lugar donde los hombres no se avergüencen de ser vagos'.
14. At one point this contradiction is explicitly addressed, and is 'resolved' with typical sophistry:  
Queremos la paz, pero al mismo tiempo queremos la lucha. ¿Cómo se entiende esto? Queremos luchar contra el mal, es decir, contra todas las

fuerzas secretas que en España - si existen - y fuera de España quisieran arrancarnos nuestra fe y nuestras virtudes. [...] Queremos la lucha contra nuestros defectos y malos apetitos para conquistar nuestra libertad interior, que es la más preciada. [...] Paz y lucha, lucha y paz: tal es la vida y así quiero vivirla. (*Así quiero ser*, p.67)

15. Quoted in Sopeña Monsalve, p.225.
16. The choice of three fascist examples - Italy, Germany and Portugal - is evidently not accidental, however, and suggests an orthodox scheme in which all nations are equal in being justifiably patriotic, but some are more equal than others. Though subsequent examples do include other countries, they are used explicitly to reject internationalism: 'Querer a Italia, a Alemania, a Inglaterra, a Egipto ..., conformes, pero los españoles debemos querer a España antes y más que a otra nación cualquiera [...]. No acepto la neutralidad internacional, es decir, el amar a España lo mismo que a Noruega o a la China. [...] No, no, primero, España; después, España, y siempre España' (*Así quiero ser*, p.29).
17. Emilio Alonso de Burgos, *Cortesía juvenil* (Madrid: Don Bosco, 1967), p.75; quoted in Amando de Miguel, 'La transmisión de las ideologías autoritarias a través de los textos escolares', *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*, 32-34 (p.34.)
18. Feliciano Cereceda, *Historia del Imperio Español y de la Hispanidad* (Madrid: Razón y Fe, 1940), p.257; quoted in Sopeña, p.190.
19. Manuel Tuñón de Lara, 'La interpretación policial de la historia', *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*, 35-37 (p.36).
20. With reference to totalitarian regimes, Schapiro writes that 'nothing provides a more convincing justification for terror than the claim, constantly reiterated, that the nation is pursuing some great and noble aim, to which all effort must be constantly devoted, and that this aim is being frustrated by internal and external enemies who must be destroyed' (Schapiro, p.38).
21. Agustín Serrano de Haro, *España es así*, 24th edn (Madrid: Escuela Española, 1964), pp.169-70.
22. At the beginning of the War Spain declared itself neutral. In 1940 the official posture was changed to 'non-belligerence', and Franco met Hitler in Hendaya. By 1943, the regime was seeking regular contact with the British ambassador in Madrid, Sir Samuel Hoare, and official neutrality was resumed (Paul Preston, *Franco: A Biography*, (London: HarperCollins, 1993), pp.342-531; hereafter referred to as *Franco*).
23. Cited in Jacqueline Hurlley, *José Janés: Editor de literatura inglesa* (Barcelona: Promociones y Publicaciones Universitarias, 1992), p.49.
24. Max Gallo, *Histoire de l'Espagne franquiste*, (Paris: Ruedo Ibérico, 1971), p.137; quoted in Gubern, p.54.
25. *Franco*, pp.535-36, 540, 553-54; Gubern, p.93.

26. Preston in fact reveals that Anglo-American concerns regarding the spread of Communism to Spain, if a new civil war were to be provoked, determined international policy on Spain from as early as 1947. Both France and the Soviet Union made specific moves to respond more decisively to the continued presence of a fascist-assisted regime in Europe, but the softer British and American approach ultimately prevailed (*Franco*, pp.556-60).
27. Luis Alonso Tejada, *La represión sexual en la España de Franco*, (Barcelona: Caralt, 1977), p.93.
28. Jordi Monés, 'Cuatro décadas de educación franquista: aspectos ideológicos', *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*, 11-16 (pp.11-12 ).
29. Juan Ruíz Rico, *El sexo de sus señoras: Sexualidad y tribunales de justicia en España*, (Madrid: Temas de Hoy, 1991), pp.45, 76, 86, 167. Ruíz's findings coincide with those of Tejada, who describes the role of women under Franco as follows:  

La represión se encaminó a fomentar la pasividad sexual de la mujer y a convertirla en una perfecta 'máquina de parir' - se la pide que cultive la virginidad como soltera, así que llega al matrimonio inexperta y sin interés por el sexo.

Su función como mujer en el matrimonio es la de servir de apaciguamiento de la concupiscencia masculina, pero sin la menor complacencia, con fría resignación. De esta manera, asume inconscientemente el papel de reprimidora de la agresividad sexual del varón, al que inculca el mayor desentendimiento erótico posible.

Esta actitud de la mujer española respondía al impulso ascético que la había sido inculcado por una milenaria educación de misoginia y pudor. (Tejada, pp.31-32)
30. Marina Subirats, 'La mujer domada', *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*, 43-44 (p.43).
31. Orden Ministerial de 5 de marzo 1938; cited in Subirats, p.44 and Tejada, p.103.
32. J. Lasso de la Vega, 'La selección de libros: reglas para bibliotecarios, editores, libreros y lectores', *Bibliografía Hispánica*, 4.1 (January 1945), 1-25, p.11.
33. Pablo Juvilla Camarasa, *Rutas de orientación juvenil*, (Madrid: Cocusa, 1958), p.158; quoted in Tejada, p.113.
34. Francisco Cervera y Jiménez Alfaro, 'Orientación editorial sobre el libro infantil', *Bibliografía Hispánica*, 5.5 (May 1946), 285-89. Though it is not stated specifically, it is clear from the content of the article that the author's recommendations apply to male children only. This article has little to say concerning gender prescriptions, therefore (though the orthodox male stereotype is reinforced).
35. The preeminence of the morality criterion is evident in the seven-point plan for a series of *clásicos expurgados* drawn up by the Gabinete:
  - 1) Escoger obras de asuntos moralmente limpios.
  - 2) Sustituir las crudezas de lenguaje, si las hubiera, por otras frases o palabras en letra bastardilla. (p.287)

The remaining items of the specification are practical considerations such as notes on authors and characters, the inclusion of contemporary drawings with explanations etc..

36. Carolina Toral, 'Más sobre orientación editorial: Ensayo de selección de bibliotecas para niñas de 11 a 16 años', *Bibliografía Hispánica*, 5.7 (July 1946), 455-63.
37. In his nostalgic essay on the *William* series, Fernando Savater recalled that it was precisely the disparity between William and the protagonists of more orthodox children's works which made Crompton's hero so attractive to the Spanish child of the Franco era:
- Lo más infame de los 'libros infantiles' eran los niños que, invariablemente, los protagonizaban: obedientes hasta la esclavitud o traviesos hasta el crimen, afortunados o desdichados sin haber llegado a merecer ninguno de estos destinos, pacientes de la furia ejemplar de unas Tablas de la Ley que habían decidido ilustrarse a su costa, propensos a las más vacuas ocupaciones y los juegos menos atractivos, rematadamente *estúpidos* por decirlo todo de una vez.... (Emphasis as in original; Fernando Savater, 'El triunfo de los proscritos' in Fernando Savater, *La infancia recuperada* (Madrid: Taurus, 1976), pp.63-73)



## CHAPTER TWO: FRANCOIST CENSORSHIP

For the smooth preservation of order, power should not be exaggerated beyond certain tacitly agreed limits. If those limits are transgressed revealing the arbitrary character of the arrangement, the balance has been disturbed, and must be restored. (Ariel Dorfmann and Armand Mattelart)<sup>1</sup>

### Introduction

The purpose of the present chapter is to describe the nature and evolution of the Francoist censorship apparatus. The overarching legislation which in principle governed all Francoist censorship practice is described first. The evolution of censorship under successive *Ministros de Información y Turismo* is also described. Where relevant, italicized sections draw attention to how this evolution might relate to the censorship of English children's literature particularly, as in the previous chapter.

Legislative and other factors which affected the censorship of, particularly, foreign literature and children's literature are considered in separate sections. Examples of censorship reports consulted in the Archivo General de la Administración del Estado at Alcalá de Henares are used to illustrate various points. Evidence provided by previous published studies relating to Francoist censorship (and other relevant subjects) is also adduced to support the claim that the regime's control of children's literature reveals its totalitarian aspiration to perpetuate its ideology, and that foreignness had a special importance in the censorship of children's books.

### Part I: The Character and Evolution of the Censorship Apparatus

#### (i) The Legislative Origins of Francoist Censorship

As soon as the Nationalist rebels had constituted themselves as a governing body, they set about purging society of all traces of the enemy ideology. As early as 23 December 1936, the *Presidencia de la Junta Técnica del Estado* issued a norm prohibiting 'la producción, el comercio y la circulación de periódicos, folletos y toda clase de impresos y grabados pornográficos o de literatura socialista, comunista, libertaria y, en general, disolvente' (Gubern, p.22). Publishers, librarians and bookshop owners were given forty-eight hours to hand over any such offending material. How they were supposed to interpret the term, 'en general, disolvente', typical of Francoist legislative ambiguity, was never made fully clear.

A complementary norm issued on 16 September 1937 defined certain categories of illegal material more fully, but was still sufficiently vague to facilitate the suppression of anything at all that the nascent regime found objectionable:

Las comisiones depuradoras, a la vista de los anteriores índices o ficheros, ordenarán la retirada de los mismos de libros, folletos, revistas, publicaciones, grabados e impresos que contengan en su texto láminas o estampas con exposición de ideas disolventes, conceptos inmorales, propaganda de doctrinas marxistas y todo cuanto signifique falta de respeto a la dignidad de nuestro glorioso Ejército, atentados a la unidad de la Patria, menosprecio de la Religión Católica y de cuanto se oponga al significado y fines de Nuestra Gran Cruzada Nacional. (Gubern, p.23)

The *Ley de Prensa e Imprenta* of 1938 created detailed mechanisms for the rigorous control of the press, including obligatory inscription in official registers for editors and journalists, state monopoly of training institutions for journalists, and creation of regulatory bodies at national and provincial levels. However, its provisions for the functioning of censorship were contained in a single Article (Eighteen), and remained vague:

Independientemente de aquellos hechos constitutivos de delitos o faltas, que se recogen en la legislación penal, el Ministerio encargado del Servicio Nacional de Prensa tendrá facultad para castigar gubernativamente todo escrito que directa o indirectamente tienda a mermar el prestigio de la Nación o del Régimen, entorpezca la labor del Gobierno en el Nuevo Estado o siembre ideas perniciosas entre los intelectualmente débiles.<sup>2</sup>

The largely self-protective tone of this Article, which stresses the importance of maintaining the reputation of the incipient regime, reflects the provisional character of Francoist censorship as it was originally conceived. Elsewhere in the text there are unequivocal indications that state censorship in the blanket fashion envisaged by the *Ley de Prensa* of 1938 was implanted only as a temporary measure, to be suppressed as soon as political stability was achieved: Article Two, item five established state control over 'la censura, mientras no se disponga su supresión' (Beneyto, p.409), whilst Article Six enumerated the responsibilities of the *Jefe Provincial del Servicio de Prensa*, the first of which was to 'ejercer la censura, mientras ésta subsista' (Beneyto, p.410).

Two ministerial Orders, issued on 29 April 1938 and 15 July 1939, established that all printed material, whether of Spanish or foreign origin, had to be submitted for censorship to the *Sección de Censura* (created by the latter Order), which answered

to the *Servicio Nacional de Propaganda*.<sup>3</sup> A mechanism for censoring all printed material was thus formally established, but with the implicit promise that it would be dismantled as soon as censorship became unnecessary.

In fact, the censorship regime imposed by the 1938 *Ley de Prensa* and these subsequent decrees remained substantially unchanged until 1966. The subsistence of this provisional and highly ambiguous legislation explains the single most salient feature of Francoist censorship, namely its arbitrariness.<sup>4</sup> Because of the fragile intellectual foundations of its ideology and the necessity of adapting to the wider political evolution, the regime required legislation which allowed it to exercise draconian control without the necessity of being consistent, as if it were in a perpetual state of emergency. The 1938 *Ley de Prensa* fulfilled this requirement perfectly.

In as far as it does define prohibited categories of material, the early censorship legislation bears the characteristic stamp of National-Catholic ideology, proscribing pornography specifically and immorality generally, along with attacks on the Church, the army and national unity. As is also often the case with Francoist discourse, however, empty and ambiguous National-Catholic rhetoric in the early censorship legislation is accompanied by a hard-nosed pragmatism in the face of economic necessity. This is evident in the *Orden Ministerial* of 29 April 1938, which as well as establishing the obligation to submit all Spanish and foreign books for censorship (Article One), also implanted an explicitly practical censorship criterion in Article Two:

El organismo encargado de la censura podrá denegar la autorización de impresos, no sólo por razones de índole doctrinal, sino también cuando se trate de obras que, sin estimarse necesarias ni insustituibles, puedan contribuir en las actuales circunstancias de la industria del papel a entorpecer la publicación de otros impresos que respondan a atenciones preferentes.<sup>5</sup>

In this Article, an ideological virtue is made of economic necessity, the paper shortage being cited as a pretext for excluding texts merely because they are 'unnecessary'. A hierarchy of works, competing against each other for publication and judged according to National-Catholic orthodoxy, is thus potentially established. Once again, ambiguity is used to install a mechanism of blanket control: there is no explanation of what the crucial terms 'necesarias ni insustituibles' and 'otros impresos que respondan a atenciones preferentes' might mean in practice. It is obvious, however,

that National-Catholic dogma was the yardstick by which works were likely to be evaluated.

This remarkably totalitarian provision in the regime's early legislation has thus far not been mentioned in published studies of Francoist censorship. This may well be because no example has yet come to light of Article Two being specifically invoked in order to suppress a text. A persuasive argument for considering translated and children's literature censorship as distinct categories is the fact that the principle of Article Two *was* invoked by the censors in the particular case of children's literature, and that the foreign provenance of a book meant that it was ranked low down in the hierarchy which Article Two established (see p.117, below).

Article Three of the same *Orden Ministerial* establishes certain technicalities relating to the application procedure:

A los efectos de lo dispuesto en el artículo anterior, al solicitar el permiso de impresión, se expresará el número de pliegos, el de ejemplares de la tirada y la clase de papel que se desea emplear. Igual declaración se formulará cuando se pretenda hacer nueva tirada o reimpresión de obras editadas con anterioridad.

The obligation to specify the number of pages in the book and the size of the print-run thus ostensibly relates to the paper-saving discrimination procedure described in Article Two. These data, along with the proposed sale price of the finished product, continued to be required on the censorship application form long after the paper shortage had ceased to be a genuine concern, however. The censors continued to keep a close eye on these details as a means of gauging the intended readership, and therefore the potential ideological impact, of the publication in question. This attention to price, particularly, and to the size of the print-run, is a consequence of the authoritarian paternalism evident in Article Eighteen of the *Ley de Prensa*, in which texts tending to disseminate 'ideas perniciosas entre los intelectualmente débiles' were proscribed (Beneyto, p.413).<sup>6</sup> As will become apparent throughout Chapter 3, the target-readership factor plays a crucial role in explaining the censorship of both the *William* books and *Tom Sawyer* at various moments during the Franco era.

(ii) Early Francoist Censorship: The Arias Salgado years (1941-1962)

As is apparent from the legislative framework described above, the Francoist censorship criteria were essentially passive or defensive. The purpose of censorship was merely to protect the regime and National-Catholic ideology from ridicule. This was to be achieved by the simple expedient of scanning all printed texts for offending references. Censorship was thus installed as a simple filter mechanism. The passivity of this conception of censorship lies in the fact that there is no attempt to define what constitutes a 'good' or 'orthodox' text, nor to impose, in an active sense, a particular literary or ideological model on authors. At the points where the legislation is at all specific, it simply enumerates categories of taboo reference. The document filled in by each censor (the apparatus in theory provided for each work to be read by three censors) directly reflects this passivity:

¿Ataca al dogma?  
¿A la Iglesia o a sus Ministros?  
¿Al Régimen y a sus instituciones?  
¿A las personas que colaboran o han colaborado con el Régimen?  
Los pasajes censurables, ¿califican el contenido total de la obra?  
Informe y otras observaciones:

The wording of the censorship document reveals again the bellicose origin of the early Francoist legislation: censorship is conceived of as a defence against 'attacks' on crucial points of the National-Catholic edifice. The reason for pointing out the essentially defensive character of the early censorship legislation is that this will be contrasted below with the legislation governing children's literature, which is more prescriptive, rather than merely proscriptive.

The censorship document reveals also the preeminence of religious criteria, reflecting the overwhelming dominance of the clergy in the censorship apparatus even during the war years, when one might have expected Falangist intellectuals or military figures, and political censorship, to have been given priority. This point is forcefully made by Dionisio Ridruejo, then a Falangist, and the *Director General de Propaganda* from February 1938 to November 1940:

Durante tres años ocupé el cargo del que dependían los servicios de censura de libros, cine y teatro. Pero yo mismo no podía aflojarla ni dirigirla. Una Junta Superior, más o menos secreta y con abundante participación eclesiástica, establecía normas y confeccionaba listas de exclusiones. Eran decisiones inapelables. Luché alguna vez por que se pudieran publicar ciertas obras de

Goethe, de Kant, de Stendhal, etc.. Y casi siempre fui derrotado. Incluso lo fue mi ministro. (Beneyto, p.161)

In fact, pious ecclesiastical participation in censorship circles is likely to have increased to even greater levels in the years after Ridruejo's period as *Director General de Propaganda*. Despite his complaints concerning the appropriation of censorship duties by the clergy, it is clear that Ridruejo did manage to imbue his department with a certain degree of intellectual respectability:

Mi despacho se transformó más de una vez en tertulia literaria y en sala de lecturas y recitales, y añadiré que, por virtud de ello, se fue transformando el vínculo funcional de los que trabajábamos en la propaganda (y de otros allegados) en un vínculo de grupo intelectual más generacional, quizá, que ideológico. El erudito Tovar, el ensayista Laín, los universitarios Uría y Conde, los poetas que acabo de nombrar [Luis Rosales y Leopoldo Panero], los novelistas Zunzúnegui, ya lanzado, Agustí, aún en agraz, los pintores Caballero y Escassi, el escultor Aladrén, el dramaturgo Torrente Ballester y alguno más, anticipábamos ya lo que, con algunas ampliaciones, constituiría el grupo de *Escorial* pocos años más tarde. (Ridruejo, pp.139-40)

This atmosphere of relative cultural sophistication in Ridruejo's era was undoubtedly reflected in censorship practice itself, as we shall see below, in that early censors' reports show a strong tendency towards literary critical appraisal of the text being censored. The very fact that censorship was the province of a department, run by a poet, whose principal responsibility was long-term cultural reconstruction suggests the extent to which it was initially viewed as a peripheral and probably temporary institution. Ridruejo's account of his own aspirations as *Director General de Propaganda* tends to confirm the impression that overtly political mechanisms such as direct propaganda or censorship were very much a secondary concern to the ambitious cultural architects of early Francoism:

El adoctrinamiento directo por textos e imágenes o la organización de actos públicos me parecía algo insustancial y subalterno. El plan que me tracé para organizar los servicios era más amplio y, si se quiere, más totalitario en el sentido estricto de la palabra. Apuntaba al dirigismo cultural y a la organización de los instrumentos de comunicación pública en todos los órdenes. Era un plan probablemente siniestro, pero no banal. Lo malo - o lo bueno - es que quedaba muy por encima de los recursos disponibles y de mi propia autoridad. Y que, en rigor, no era lo que se me pedía.

Para dar una idea de lo que quiero decir precisaré que, por ejemplo, mi idea del Departamento de Ediciones de la Dirección General no debía limitarse a publicar ciertas obras o a ejercer la censura, sino organizar corporativamente el gremio organizando, a través de él, una verdadera planificación. En el teatro

- otro ejemplo - no aspiraba sólo a crear unas compañías oficiales ni a controlar a las privadas, sino a promover una serie de instituciones docentes y normativas - algo como la Comédie Française - y a promover centros experimentales, unidades de extensión popular, trashumantes o fijas, y a intervenir la propia Sociedad de Autores, organizando otras paralelas para actores, decoradores etcétera. En alguna manera me guiaba por la utopía falangista de la sindicación general del país y ello podía valer, claro está, para el cine, las artes plásticas, los espectáculos de masas y así sucesivamente.

Es obvio que tales empeños chocaban con la realidad. (Ridruejo, p.130)

As Ridruejo grimly recalled, however, the ecclesiastical authorities very quickly appropriated control of censorship, and their influence soon became overwhelming as a result, firstly, of the general 'defalangization' of government from late 1942 onwards. Then, decisively, in 1945, the organ responsible for censorship, the *Vicesecretaría de Educación Popular* was transferred from the aegis of the *Secretaría General del Movimiento*, a Falange-dominated government organ, to the *Ministerio de Educación* under the fundamentalist Catholic José Ibáñez Martín. As well as increasing the ecclesiastical influence, this transfer reflects the shift from a concept of censorship as a temporary instrument of cultural engineering in the *Nuevo Estado*, to a merely paternalistic notion according to which the populace were viewed as impressionable children, to be protected from the dangers of the book.<sup>7</sup>

Since its creation in 1941, the *Vicesecretaría de Educación Popular* had been headed by Gabriel Arias Salgado, described by Luis Alonso Tejada as the 'Torquemada cultural del franquismo' (Tejada, p.93) and by Luis María Ansón as '[un] muro inagrietable para toda una generación' (Beneyto, p.200).<sup>8</sup> In 1951, Arias was promoted to the rank of Minister, presiding over the newly created *Ministerio de Información y Turismo*. He remained in control of the censorship apparatus until he was replaced in 1962 by Manuel Fraga Iribarne. Luis María Ansón succinctly characterizes Arias's period in office, in terms which emphasize again the paternalistic nature of Francoist censorship:

La época en que regentó el Ministerio de Información y Turismo fue la década triste de la cultura española. La censura hizo un tenaz esfuerzo por convertir a los periódicos en hojas parroquiales preconciliares; redujo a nuestro cine y nuestro teatro a la beatería y el folklorismo; prohibió infinidad de libros de novelistas y poetas que enriquecieron a varias editoriales hispanoamericanas y trató políticamente como si fueran niños de pecho a los hombres de pelo en pecho. (Beneyto, pp.200-01)

The continued presence of a Minister of Information who literally believed he was saving souls from damnation by censoring immorality (Tejada, pp.92-93), during a decade in which the nation generally was apparently opening itself to the outside world politically and economically, confirms the impression that the regime's liberalization in this era was largely cosmetic. As reactionary sectors of society thundered against the scourge of immorality spreading throughout the country as a consequence of the influx of dissolute foreigners (Gubern, pp.137-38), the censorship apparatus seemed intent on vaccinating the population from infection. Censorship reports for both Spanish and foreign literature are thus dominated by a tone of indignant piety during the Arias era, in which religious or 'moral' censorship predominated. The regime's continuing fidelity to the ecclesiastical origins of Francoist censorship, for example, are exposed in the censor's four-word rejection of the Editorial Tor's application to publish a mere 200 copies of Victor Hugo's *Les Misérables* in 1951: 'Figura en el *Index*'.<sup>9</sup>

Any attempt to question the benevolence of the clergy was still doomed to failure under Arias. Ramón Sopena's unsuccessful application to publish Alfred de Musset's *La confesión de un hijo del siglo* in 1958, for example, received the following assessment: 'Pinta el autor sus desengaños amorosos con Jorge Sand y retrata en general el ambiente deplorable que le rodea sin perjuicio de cargar la cuenta de aquellas injusticias y veleidades a personas que nada tienen que ver con ellas, como el clero, por ejemplo'.<sup>10</sup>

Carlos Fortuny's attempt to publish, in 1960, his biography *La Fornarina y su tiempo* foundered as a result of the continued adherence to fundamentalist dogma in the area of sexual mores. The censor conceded that 'en este libro se contiene una rica y amplia información sobre el movimiento y desarrollo de una serie de manifestaciones, algunas muy interesantes y bellas, de ciertos géneros de nuestra vida teatral'. He felt he must reject the application, however, because 'el libro arrastra barro, pero un barro de homosexualismo y de invertidos que da miedo' (underlined as in original).<sup>11</sup>

Although the dominant characteristic of Francoist censorship in the Arias period is its stringency in the area of religion and morality, political censorship also played a powerful role in suppressing social awareness. All overtly left-wing texts



were prohibited. Works which described the plight of the working poor in Spain were heavily censored: Francisco Candel, the author who most audaciously challenged the censor by writing about the working classes, remarked that 'siempre me han suprimido obsesivamente [...] las cuestiones relacionadas con la problemática obrera' (Beneyto, p.39). As a direct consequence of this latter taboo, particularly, the style known as 'photographic realism' came into being in the 1950s. It is a style which accurately reflects the age: by the 1950s, authors such as Juan and Luis Goytisolo, Jesús Fernández Santos, Juan García Hortelano, Rafael Sánchez Ferlosio and Armando López Salinas had acquired a sufficiently objective perspective on the Civil War and its aftermath, and sufficient access to knowledge of Spain and the outside world, to feel equipped to denounce the country's economic, political and cultural stagnation, but censorship forced them to adopt a style so detached and allusive that it now reads like a coded message. Orthodox fears that the foreign influx would corrupt their 'innocent' (i.e. repressed and disenfranchised) charges were no doubt heightened by the emergence of a socially committed group of writers including the aforementioned novelists, dramatists such as Antonio Buero Vallejo and Alfonso Sastre, and poets such as Blas de Otero and Gabriel Celaya.

Despite this fear of raised political awareness, however, the primacy of religious or moral censorship, a consequence of the enduring ecclesiastical dominance of the censorship apparatus, can hardly be overstated. A striking example of the preeminence of religious or moral over political censorship is provided by Bardem and Berlanga's 1952 film *Bienvenido Mr. Marshall*. A proposed scene in which the local schoolmistress in the archetypal Spanish village portrayed in the film dreamt about frolicking with a team of strapping American football players was suppressed by the censors, whilst an obvious parody of Franco's speeches was retained. Gubern suggests that the censors simply failed to notice the parody, and that Franco permitted the film because he saw it as reflecting his own private interpretation of the deal with the North Americans, namely that a spiritually superior nation (Spain) was being forced to accept financial aid from a horde of vulgar materialists as a matter of mere necessity (Gubern, pp.141-42). Political censorship was thus influenced by the ambivalent posture of the regime at the time, particularly when portrayals of the foreign introduced subtle considerations of point of view.

It is important to emphasize that during the Arias period, although state censorship on the Francoist scale was beginning to seem ever more anachronistic in the eyes of the Western democracies, in Spain it was still consonant with the general character of society. Thus although censorship was undoubtedly denounced for its harshness by those who suffered it, such protest was marginal, whereas voluble and powerful sectors of society, such as the *Asociaciones de Padres de Familia* and the clergy, attacked it for not being rigorous enough.<sup>12</sup> There was thus a rise in 'non-ministerial' censorship which took the form of seizures of books already in circulation following denunciation by members of reactionary groups such as the two cited above, and the police or military authorities.

The time was clearly not yet ripe for a cultural liberalization to match the greater economic and political openness heralded by the arrival of the technocrats in government in 1957. Gubern suggests that a slightly increased tolerance of eroticism in the cinema is perceptible from around 1956 onwards, but he generally concurs with other commentators that the Arias era was one of cultural stagnation brought on by the continuing rigours of censorship (Gubern, p.123).

Abellán characterizes the Arias era as one of 'rigidez total' (Abellán, p.152), and makes the observation that preemptive censorship by the publisher ('censura editorial') was rife in this era. This practice is understandable given the dire economic consequences for a publisher of being stigmatized as problematic by the regime. The regime could ruin a publisher by arbitrarily seizing entire print-runs of editions, or by deferring judgement on texts for so long (sometimes indefinitely) that the publisher was unable to market his product or balance his books (see p.151, below, for an example of this).

By the beginning of the 1960s, however, domestic living standards were rising, tourism was still on the increase and a new radical youth was emerging in the Western democracies. The paternalistic approach to censorship espoused by Arias was thus beginning to seem embarrassingly anachronistic. In 1962, the dynamic young Falangist Manuel Fraga Iribarne was thus brought in to modernize the image of the regime through the *Ministerio de Información y Turismo*. In the following section, therefore, we shall turn to the evolution of censorship under Fraga and his successors.

*Given the intellectually refined composition of the very earliest Francoist censorship apparatus (1938-1941), we may expect early censorship reports on children's literature to have contained literary appraisals of the works under scrutiny. Although the reports are likely to reflect National-Catholic doctrine, since the intellectuals were largely members of the Falange, it is likely that orthodox dogmatism in censorship, with particular emphasis on religious and moral censorship, will be particularly perceptible from 1941 onwards, with the transfer of censorship to the Vicesecretaría de Educación Popular under Arias Salgado.*

*Reactionary piety is likely to have been a persistent feature of reports in the isolation years from the end of the Second World War until the early 1950s, as censorship became the province of the Ministerio de Educación, a traditional ecclesiastical stronghold under Franco. The liberalization of certain areas of the regime during the 1950s does not appear to have had a significant impact on the area of censorship as a whole, which remained in the hands of the deeply conservative Arias Salgado. If the evolution of children's literature censorship ran parallel to that of censorship generally, therefore, censors' reports from the 1950s and early 1960s are likely to reveal continuing rigour in the application of National-Catholic dogma to children's book censorship.*

### (iii) Later Francoist Censorship: Fraga and beyond

Manuel Fraga Iribarne was one of a number of ministers drafted in by Franco in the cabinet reshuffle of 10 July 1962 in order to modernize the image of the regime in the face of mounting international criticism (*Franco*, pp.704-05). Although nominally a Falangist, Fraga was (and is) first and foremost an opportunist and survivor, or 'more a versatile and flexible apparatchik of the *Movimiento* than a militant Falangist', as Preston describes him (*Franco*, p.705).

Fraga's flexibility and skill as an image-maker, or 'spin-doctor', as he would be called today, made him an ideal candidate for the delicate task at hand: placating foreign democracies and progressive domestic sectors within the regime by modernizing censorship, without overstepping the mark and thus incurring the dangerous displeasure of the reactionary faction.

The contradictions inherent in Fraga's position are reflected in his much vaunted *Ley de Prensa e Imprenta*, which was first drafted in 1964 and became law in 1966. Fraga's cosmetic coup was to do away with compulsory submission of books for censorship prior to publication ('consulta obligatoria' or 'censura previa'), except in cases of national emergency (Article Three; Beneyto, p.416). The suppression of obligatory, prior censorship of all works could be presented to the unwary, and particularly to foreign observers, as a significant liberalizing step, which supposedly brought Spain up to speed with the Western democracies with regard to freedom of expression.

The inefficacy of Article Three as a liberalizing instrument can quickly be appreciated, however, by considering the practical implications of the rest of the 1966 Law. Firstly, Article Two dispelled any suspicion that ideological pluralism might be facilitated by the new legislation, by establishing that the following constituted limitations on free speech:

Son limitaciones: el respeto a la verdad y a la moral; el acatamiento a la Ley de Principios del Movimiento Nacional y demás Leyes Fundamentales; las exigencias de la defensa nacional, de la seguridad del Estado y del mantenimiento del orden público interior y la paz exterior; el debido respeto a las instituciones y a las personas en la crítica de la acción política y administrativa; la independencia de los Tribunales, y la salvaguardia de la intimidad y del honor personal y familiar. (Beneyto, p.416)

Significantly, National-Catholic orthodoxy is given clear preeminence over the protection of the individual against invasion of privacy and libel in this Article.

How were these limitations to be imposed, one might reasonably ask, if prior censorship had been abolished? Firstly, Article Twelve of the new law established that publishers were legally obliged to deposit six copies of all printed texts at the *Ministerio de Información y Turismo* before publication (Beneyto, p.418). Although this was presented as a bureaucratic formality, in practice it meant that the *Ministerio* had the opportunity, at least, to examine all works before they were published. Furthermore, Article Four installed a voluntary consultation mechanism, of which publishers could avail themselves if they felt uncertain about the acceptability of a particular text. This presented the publishers with a cruel dilemma: collaboration could mean the imposition of unnecessary censorship, since the regime was automatically suspicious of any book submitted for voluntary consultation; erring on the other side

by publishing 'problematic' texts without consulting the censor could incur the wrath of the regime, and provoke the financial catastrophe of an entire print-run being confiscated.<sup>13</sup> In the case of publishers considered particularly troublesome, the regime made a grotesque mockery of the new legislation by enforcing *consulta 'voluntaria'* as a condition of continued existence. The *Ministerio* would refuse to concede, on vague or entirely unspecified grounds, the *número de registro* legally required by all publishers. The publisher was thus forced to continue working on a technically illegal basis, a situation which the regime 'magnanimously' overlooked, in return for which the publisher was expected to submit all works prior to publication (Cisquella, pp.55-56).

As to the application of the new norms, and whether they constituted a genuine liberalization, evidence seems to confirm Gubern's assertion that 'la apertura de Fraga fue arbitraria y zarandeada por los avatares de la coyuntura política de cada momento' (Gubern, p.184). A selective or arbitrary liberalization seems to have taken place in some areas. In the religious and moral sphere, the evidence suggests greater tolerance of eroticism and the use of indecorous language. Francisco Candel alludes to the censors showing 'algo más de manga ancha, concretamente en lo erótico o sexual' (Beneyto, p.43), though the example he gives is the authorization of Cela's *San Camilo*. Cela is known to have received preferential treatment because of his own collaboration with the regime as a censor of periodicals (Abellán, pp.69-70). José María Gironella concurs with Candel, however, in perceiving a modest increase in erotic tolerance after the 1966 Law, demonstrated by the fact that 'pueden describirse senos femeninos' (Beneyto, p.191).

Both authors emphasize the timidity of the liberalization, Candel remarking that the censor 'continúa tachando siempre que le viene en gana en plan mojigato' (Beneyto, p.43), and Gironella suggesting that 'hemos ido recibiendo migajas de libertad, limosnas' (Beneyto, p.191).

The regime's enduring aversion to sexuality in literature under Fraga is evident in censor Palacios's report on Corín Tellado's pulp romantic novel *Mentira sentimental*, published in 1965. The censor opens his report by defining the work: 'Novela pasional, con la pasión carnal conjugada en activa y en pasiva, entre besuqueos, resobeos, parcheos y todo el repertorio de actos carentes de pudor.' Palacios then

recounts the plot of the novel in some detail, railing ironically at the author's persistent exposition of intimate detail ('pues, la pareja ha tenido la gentileza de acercar a los lectores hasta a las intimidades de la alcoba nupcial'). 'Naturalmente', he concludes, 'las tachaduras recaen sobre todas estas porquerías'. The book was authorized, with suppressions on eighteen pages.<sup>14</sup>

Both Candel and Gironella identify anti-clericalism in texts as another area in which the censor's tolerance grew during Fraga's period in office and afterwards. Candel provides a succinct explanation for this particular 'liberalization':

A partir de 1966, más o menos, la jerarquía eclesiástica empieza a enfrentarse veladamente con el Estado, al mismo tiempo que el Estado considera que la tarea de narcotizar a las masas ya la hace mejor la Televisión que la Iglesia. La Iglesia de base ya le había resultado conflictiva al Estado desde mucho antes, pero lentamente ha ido culminando un lento proceso. Así es que si antes no podías decir nada contra los curas, ahora es al revés. Cuántas más cosas digas demostrando una volubilidad de la Iglesia, mejor. (Beneyto, p.43)

The rift between the regime and an increasingly radicalized Catholic Church had begun to be appreciable since the *accession to the papacy* in 1959 of Pope John XXIII <sup>and his</sup> encyclical of 1961 *Mater et Magistra*, which had aligned the Church with the trade unions and working classes generally (Franco, p.703). It was of course this new radicalized clergy only which became a legitimate target in literary texts, a nuance Candel is quick to point out: 'No obstante, según lo que digas sobre la religión o Dios, no te lo autorizarán. De todos modos, nuestra censura aún defiende la postura integrista de nuestra Iglesia' (Beneyto, pp.43-44).

In the political and ideological sphere of censorship, also, the 'liberalization' which took place under Fraga was cautious and selective in the extreme. Certain left-wing tracts began to appear on the shelves, but redeemed authors were carefully selected so that there would be no real impact on the popular consciousness. Diego Diéguez refers to 'ancient Sartre and even prehistoric Marx', and explains the cosmetic ideological liberalization thus: 'The censors felt they could allow themselves the liberty of passing such classics - scarcely attractive nowadays - knowing their "contaminating effect" would only be felt by a minority of readers already hopelessly lost to the cause - and knowing also that publication would only be authorised for small deluxe editions at prices few could afford' (Diéguez, p.95).

Diéguez's remarks also point up the importance of the stipulation that the number of copies and price of the edition must appear on the censorship application (see p.55, above). Several authors have remarked on the sensitivity of the Francoist censorship apparatus generally to these data, which reveal the target<sup>t</sup>-readership of the edition being submitted for censorship.<sup>15</sup> There is evidence, however, that these data became particularly significant in censorship practice in the later years of the dictatorship. This was because the Spanish publishing industry had undergone steady modernization during the 1950s and early 1960s. Until this period, the trade had consisted largely of small family concerns, who took a craftsman's approach to book production. Books were thus luxury items, chiefly destined for the libraries of the educated, and therefore privileged, classes.

In the 1950s and early 1960s, greater efficiency through mechanization, and the introduction of the paperback (*edición de bolsillo*) caused the price of books to drop. In the mid-1960s, just as the new *Ley de Prensa* was coming into force, publishing thus became a fully-fledged industry. A symbol of the new populism this heralded was the appearance of Alianza Editorial and their collection *El Libro del Bolsillo*, which consisted of works by intellectually prestigious authors such as Proust, Kafka and Hesse, in print-runs of ten thousand copies.<sup>16</sup>

One of the reasons that Fraga's *Ley de Prensa* did so little genuinely to liberalize censorship was that the regime was clearly alarmed by the potential of the new cheap, widely available paperbacks as a vehicle for unorthodox ideas. This unease had its origin in the traditional fear of the book as an agent of corruption (see pp.37, 38, 42, above) and in the authoritarian urge to deny knowledge to 'los intelectualmente débiles'.

Two examples of censorship reports from the early 1950s demonstrate the emergence of sensitivity to the target-readership as a consideration in censorship practice. In 1951, Saturnino Calleja attempted to import a cheap edition of Ralph Waldo Emerson's *Normas mentales* from Argentina.<sup>17</sup> The censor rejected the application with the following justification: 'Algunas veces ataca puntos de nuestro dogma, otras manifiesta ideas extravagantes pero siempre resulta original e interesante. A mi juicio, como se trata de una obra de divulgación a ínfimo precio no debería autorizarse.' The censor proposes suppressions on twelve pages (should the work be

authorized by a higher power), of references concerning, variously: the futility of worrying about theological questions; friendship as a greater source of pleasure than religion; a comparison of Christianity with Ancient Rome; the inadequacy of the prayers in the official liturgy.

The censor's description of the work as 'una obra de divulgación' is hard to explain: its philosophical subject matter, and the gap in assumptions arising from its geographical and temporal displacement from contemporary Spain, would make it an exotic object indeed for most Spaniards of the early 1950s. Nor can the censor be referring to the number of copies the publisher proposes to import, for at a mere one thousand five hundred this could not have been considered large even for Spain in 1951. The censor is probably referring to the fact that the *appearance* of the book, in accordance with its price (a mere three-and-a-half pesetas), places it in the populist category, thus raising the dangerous possibility of it falling into the hands of an impressionable, uneducated citizen. The manipulation of the appearance of books by the publishers, in an attempt to play on the suggestibility of both the censors and the reading public, seems to have been a common practice.<sup>18</sup>

Just over a year later, the Editorial Bruguera's application to publish the romantic pulp novel *Paréntesis de inquietud*, by one Trini de Figueroa, was also rejected on the grounds that the susceptibility of its intended readership made it worthy of special rigour:

Una hospiciiana se casa con un obrero y a consecuencia de la mala conducta de éste (no de sus malos tratos), se enamora de un señorito médico que la asedia. Por su fondo y su forma tendentes a justificar por todos los medios el amor y las entrevistas de la joven con el médico a espaldas del marido entiendo que no es apta la novela para el público a que va dirigida en edición económica y copiosa tirada. Por ello propongo que no se autorice.<sup>19</sup>

The first thing to note is that the report reflects various orthodox principles. The censor's parenthesis in the second line implies that the protagonist is wrong to have allowed herself to fall in love with the doctor at all if her husband has not actually maltreated her. The superior social class of the doctor is pointed up by the description 'el señorito médico'. Immediately after this, the work's chief defect is identified as its tendency to justify the power of love over all other considerations. It thus becomes clear that the report constitutes a shorthand, less bluntly articulated version of the objections to this type of fiction expressed by Carolina Toral in her



essay on books for girls (see p.41, above): the work is rejected because it suggests that social class and the institution of marriage are subordinate to true love.

Returning to the question of sensitivity to the target-readership, the work is deemed particularly inappropriate 'para el público a que va dirigida en edición económica y copiosa tirada'. Unlike Saturnino Calleja's edition of Emerson, the print-run of twelve thousand copies of *Paréntesis de inquietud* proposed by Bruguera is genuinely large for the era. The price of five pesetas, moreover, places the edition firmly in the populist category. The implication is clear: the censors feared the long-term social consequences of allowing too many of the poor to think they could improve matters by giving in to the blandishments of the smart young local doctor.

An example from 1969 confirms that this intellectually elitist criterion was still used to evaluate pulp fiction at the very end of Fraga's period in office. Bruguera's application to publish five thousand copies of Antonio Torras Presas's *Una de tantas*, at nine pesetas, also demonstrates the continuing aversion to eroticism on the part of Fraga's censors, whose approach seems to have lagged behind the more progressive outlook of the Ministry as a whole. One censor recommends suppressions on no fewer than fifty-seven pages if the book is to be made publishable. Another suggests it is 'demasiado escabroso e imposible de limpiar con tachaduras'. The third censor decisively judges in favour of the work, however, concluding his report as follows:

La novela es una clásica rosa del género, sin ningún valor literario. En realidad, carece de escenas de subido tono erótico y mucho menos de sabor pornográfico. Los consabidos besos entre enamorados, que nunca faltan en estas novelas. Ello no obstante, por el público destinatario y el precio, pueden suprimirse lo subrayado en los folios 42, 43, 62, 69, 80, 89, 92. Con tal salvedad, puede autorizarse.<sup>20</sup>

The evidence thus suggests that the target-readership of a work was a factor in censorship both during Arias Salgado's period in office and afterwards. It was not until the era of Fraga, however, that publishers began to combine all the elements viewed as dangerous by the censors with regard to the target-public criterion: books in the free-thinking, 'high literature' category of Emerson's *Normas mentales* began to appear at the low price of Calleja's edition, but in the large print-runs normally reserved for 'sub-literary' genres such as pulp fiction. The publishers who particularly specialized in the new formula of 'quality' or 'progressive' literature at cheap prices and in large print-runs were heavily persecuted by Fraga and his cohorts, who were

no doubt anxious to prove they still had a firm grip on things even though *censura previa* had officially been abolished. The publishing houses Anagrama, Ciencia Nueva and ZYX suffered particularly for their promotion of cheap editions (Cisquella, p.51). Ciencia Nueva was forced to close down permanently after being accused of having direct links with the Spanish Communist Party, and ZYX was closed temporarily and obliged to change its name, after it had gained notoriety as a purveyor of editions which were especially cheap because they were distributed by volunteers (Cisquella, pp.67-68).

Returning to the broader question of the timidity of Fraga's liberalization, even deluxe editions of progressive works were withdrawn towards the end of his period in office (Fraga was replaced on 29 October 1969), when the domestic political situation deteriorated dramatically. In stark contrast to the lack of repercussions on censorship of the liberalizations of the 1950s, the reactionary backlash of 1968 and 1969 had a direct effect on censorship practice. In 1969, at the behest of Carlos Robles Piquer, the *Director General de Cultura y Espectáculos*, a black list of left-wing texts which had already been published or were about to be published was drawn up. Distribution of these works was forbidden by law (Cisquella, p.64). Many applications to publish new translations of Marxist works were also refused in this year (Abellán, p.228).

By late 1969, even Fraga's modest liberalizations seemed excessive to the increasingly indignant reactionary sectors of society. Carrero Blanco used this fact, and specifically Fraga's inopportune airing of the *Matesa* scandal in the press, as a means to unseat the upstart minister. Carrero, now in de facto control of the government, installed the dour obscurantist Alfredo Sánchez Bella at the *Ministerio de Información y Turismo* as part of his technocrat-dominated 'monochrome' cabinet (Franco, pp.744-47).

Sánchez Bella's period in office marked a return to the militant puritanism of the Arias days. The new minister appointed another inflexible right-winger, Enrique Tomás de Carranza, as his *Director General de Cultura Popular y Espectáculos*, one of whose principal responsibilities was the day-to-day running of the censorship apparatus. Despite Sánchez Bella's claim that he could control the Press by manipulating advertising and paper quotas, thus avoiding heavy-handed reprisals

(Gubern, p.248), he and Carranza nevertheless managed to close down Rafael Calvo Serer's combative daily *Madrid* in November 1971. The new reactionary duo also imposed heavy fines and long suspensions on *Triunfo*, and forced the closure of the Editorial Estela (Cisquella, pp.102-03).

It was during Sánchez Bella's mandate that non-governmental forces even further to the right of the ultra-conservative Catholic minister began to take censorship duties into their own hands. At the very end of the 1960s, a neo-fascist political grouping known as *Fuerza Nueva* emerged under the fanatical leadership of Blas Piñar López, a member of the *Consejo Nacional* and friend of Carrero Blanco. Piñar and his followers took it upon themselves to denounce many works of literature, both directly to the *Ministerio de Información y Turismo* and through their organ, also called *Fuerza Nueva*. Their expressions of indignation were not limited to verbal attacks on literature, however. By 1969, terror squads linked to *Fuerza Nueva* and calling themselves *Los Guerrilleros de Cristo Rey* had begun to operate, replacing the Civil Guard as instruments of the most brutal repression at strikes and demonstrations organized by the new radical clergy (Franco, p.748).

Under Sánchez Bella, these gangs of hired thugs and fanatical Falange members turned to the task of assisting the government in the distasteful business of suppressing culture. Bookshops and publishing houses were vandalized for displaying works by Picasso or Neruda. Other reviled authors included Freud, Jung and Brecht, whose *Caucasian Chalk Circle* was taken off the stage by Sánchez Bella (Cisquella, p.103). Other theatrical productions which had started their run were also cancelled by the Minister (Gubern, p.249), no doubt provoking severe financial difficulties for many managers, directors and performers. Works relating to twentieth-century China, post-revolutionary Cuba, the Russian revolution and even structuralism, though they might be merely analytical, were considered by the publishers to constitute a potential provocation to the vigilantes. Though the effect of the vigilantes' attacks on the actual availability of works is impossible to quantify precisely, there can be no doubt that they were a powerful incentive for bookshop owners and publishers to avoid certain types of text.<sup>21</sup>

Partly out of personal conviction and partly as a response to the ominous increase in reactionary activity, Sánchez Bella imposed extra official rigour in both the

areas of political and sexual censorship (pornography was the vigilantes' other major target). With respect to the former category, Gubern refers to the 'aguda susceptibilidad política aportada por Sánchez Bella a su Ministerio', and cites various examples of political censorship of films in this era (Gubern, pp.252-53).

Gubern's observations are borne out by a literary example from the censorship archives. Manuel Romero Sánchez-Herrera's *Durandín: Estampas de la Guerra Civil* received the following appraisal from one censor:

La obra, escrita en deplorable estilo [...] pretende ser un testimonio de los desmanes cometidos por los rojos, los sufrimientos de sus víctimas y el mérito de los que, exponiendo sus propias vidas, se esforzaban en mitigar sufrimientos. Aunque el sentido de la obra es francamente favorable a la causa nacional, hay que hacer notar sin embargo algunas expresiones desfavorables llamando 'fascistas' a los nacionales. Páginas: 23 (alude al jefe del Estado), 44, 51, 52, 61, 169 y un pasaje de las páginas 12 y 13 donde se establece una comparación entre el comportamiento contra los enemigos de uno y otro bando antes y después de la guerra.<sup>22</sup>

The second censor, showing an awareness of point of view, takes a more nuanced approach to the use of the term *fascista*: 'En boca de Republicanos o Izquierdistas, como expresión de sus sentimientos ideológicos es aceptable, pero no así cuando se utiliza en comentarios y juicios de valor del autor.' The same censor's other specific objection shows how closely he has examined the text: 'Igualmente consideramos inaceptable el apelativo 'huestes' referido a las tropas de Queipo de Llano (p.115).' The work was authorized for publication in September 1970, with suppressions on seven pages.

The fact that a badly written work which the censors themselves felt was generally favourable, in an edition produced by the author himself and with a print-run of a mere five hundred copies, was felt worthy of the hair-splitting scrutiny it received confirms the impression that strict political censorship continued unabated under Sánchez Bella.

This continued rigour is perhaps unsurprising given the prevailing climate of increased political turmoil, particularly as a consequence of intensified terrorist activity on the part of ETA. As Gubern reports, however, extra rigour in the censorship of sexual allusions was even more manifest in the Sánchez Bella era, at least in the cinema (Gubern, p.253).

Sánchez Bella's successor Fernando de Liñán y Zofio, nominated on 12 June 1973 by Carrero Blanco (now *Presidente del Gobierno*), held his post only until the Admiral was assassinated by ETA on 20 December of the same year (Gubern, p.245). With the regime's internal contradictions becoming ever more apparent, the new head of government, Prime Minister Carlos Arias Navarro, formed a cabinet described by Preston as 'a curious rag-bag of hard-liners and progressives' (*Franco*, p.764). Firmly in the latter camp was the new *Ministro de Información y Turismo*, Pío Cabanillas Gallas who, as Fraga had been before him, was entrusted with the task of improving the regime's image. It is generally acknowledged that during Cabanillas's ten months in office a genuine liberalization of censorship took place (Cisquella, pp.109-17).

Cabanillas quickly went too far, however. In a replay of Fraga's ousting, Franco was presented with a dossier, compiled by right-wingers, testifying to Cabanillas's decidedly more permissive approach to erotic material and the reporting of political scandals (*Franco*, p.771). Cabanillas was thus replaced by León Herrera Esteban in October 1974 (Gubern, p.251). Esteban continued Cabanillas's liberalizing tendency overall, but clamped down on allusions to political unrest in the Press (Cisquella, p.31). He prohibited all mention of matters relating to the state of emergency declared in the Basque Provinces in mid-1975, for example (Gubern, p.251).

The periods in office of Herrera and his successor Adolfo Martín Gamero (December 1975 - July 1976) were characterized by multiple confiscations, suspensions and arrests of journalists from newspapers and magazines (such as the newly launched *Cambio 16*) in which articles criticizing or questioning the status quo had begun to appear in ever-increasing numbers.<sup>23</sup> Many editors of newspapers and magazines, determined to tip the balance towards a transition as the Caudillo's death became imminent, began to show unprecedented audacity in this period. In the turmoil of the last months of the regime, however, it would seem unlikely that the moribund book censorship apparatus, already helped on its way to extinction by the Cabanillas era, was functioning at anything like its former levels of activity.

*If foreign children's literature censorship evolved parallel to book censorship generally, it can be assumed that the Fraga period (10 July 1962 - 28 October 1969) was characterized by a very timid and selective liberalization. The culmination of the process of industrial development which took place in the Spanish publishing industry*

*from the 1950s onwards may have resulted in a greater sensitivity to the target-readership on the part of the censors in the Fraga era and afterwards. The emergence of large-scale, efficient publishing houses, producing and disseminating large numbers of cheap classics, and the corresponding attempts of the censor to check this free dissemination of both 'dangerously' progressive, high literary products and pulp fiction of 'dubious' moral character may well also have had an impact on the censorship of children's literature.*

*The era of Alfredo Sánchez Bella (29 October 1969 - 11 June 1973) is likely to have been one of renewed intolerance of transgressions in any area of official dogma in children's literature. The brief mandate of Fernando de Liñán y Zofio (12 June 1973 - 2 January 1974) is likely to have continued this trend.*

*A significant liberalization in the censorship of foreign children's literature may well have taken place during the period in which Pío Cabanillas Gallas and Ricardo de la Cierva held sway at the Ministerio de Información y Turismo (3 January 1974 - 29 October 1974). Somewhat greater rigour in censorship generally returned during the periods in office of León Herrera Esteban (30 October 1974 - December 1975) and of Adolfo Martín Gamero (December 1975 - July 1976), as a result of the political turmoil caused by the Caudillo's physical decline, and then by his death. It is unlikely that this was reflected in children's book censorship, however, whose existence at all is likely to have been regarded as an obsolete remnant of the old order from which so many were now frantically trying to dissociate themselves.*

## **Part II: The Censorship of Translated Literature**

The present section reviews the evidence for the existence of a distinct model for foreign literature censorship under Franco.

It has already been established that one of the most salient ideological features of Francoism was its xenophobia (see pp.21-24, above). As we have seen in the present chapter, early Francoist censorship legislation reflects this xenophobia, by banning all works which do not accord with its own very peculiar ideology, thus automatically excluding many foreign works. Apart from the specific proscription of left-wing ideas, 'pornography' or attacks on the persons or institutions of the regime, however, no indication is given of how directly a work would have to

contradict the official doctrine in order to require suppression. What constitutes an 'idea perniciosa' is very much left to the discretion of the individual censor. It is thus difficult to surmise on the basis of the legislation alone how foreign literature may have fared in the early Francoist period.

In order to answer this question, one must turn to sources of secondary or parallel censorship, such as official journals. Journals such as *Bibliografía Hispánica* were used by the regime to encourage conformity and issue ad hoc advice concerning the censorship norms being applied at any given time.

The unashamedly interventionist aims of *Bibliografía Hispánica* are expressed in frank terms in its first issue:

Viene a implantar una política del libro o, mejor aún, a introducir en el dominio del libro la gran política española de la Falange. [...] Una revolución de tipo preeminentemente espiritual, que pone principal acento en restablecer el imperio moral de España en el mundo, necesita por exigencia de su misma naturaleza, controlar la producción editorial, vehículo del pensamiento, y encauzarla en derechura a su finalidad.<sup>24</sup>

One matter repeatedly discussed in the volumes of *Bibliografía Hispánica*, particularly during the 1940s, is the 'excessive' number of translations on the Spanish book market. In December 1942 Miguel Herrero, the head of the *Sección de Ordenación Bibliográfica* of the *Instituto Nacional del Libro Español* (INLE) and also a censor (Hurtley, p.159), devoted almost an entire article to the matter.<sup>25</sup> He explicitly addressed the crux of the censorship problem with respect to translations, that is their intractability to localized suppression because they embody a world view:

Hay materias, que por mucho examen a que se las someta, siempre contienen un sinnúmero de elementos imponderables e insumisos a la acción de la censura, que actúan en España como factores patógenos de desintegración y maleamiento del alma nacional. Es el ambiente, es el espíritu, es la concepción del mundo y de la vida en que los autores extranjeros colocan su escenario y mueven sus criaturas. (p.5)

Herrero's explanation of why this problem is particularly acute in the area of literature once again reveals the deep-seated suspicion of the literary text as an agent of indoctrination because of its sensual potentialities:

Las novelas, las biografías novelescas, los cuentos infantiles, lo que seduce, en suma, al ánimo, lo que subyuga la voluntad, lo que excita los sentimientos y los inclina, como el aire a la llama, de este lado o del otro, todo esto se traduce a caño abierto del extranjero, sin que exista medio humano de evitar que nos importen un concepto del mundo y de la vida totalmente contrario a

la concepción que llamamos nuestra, que nos vanagloriamos de llamar española. (p.5)

The author then addresses a particular genre, the detective novel, and in doing so reveals a crucial disagreement in official circles about how the imbalance in the book market should be remedied. Herrero quotes from a newspaper article by A. Abad Ojuel, who asserts that the detective novel is essentially foreign, because the cold, cerebral inhumanity of the criminal in such works is simply not a Spanish characteristic:

Y la verdad es que el género aún no ha cundido entre las plumas nacionales porque no va con nuestra psicología. Hemos de rendirnos ante lo anglosajón en lo que se refiere a tener los mejores criminales del mundo. Por eso tienen los mejores policías y los mejores novelistas de este género. ¿Qué necesidad hemos tenido nosotros de organizar Scotland Yard, si el crimen turbio, científico, premeditado, inhumano, no cunde entre nosotros? (p.6)

The popularity of the detective protagonists of such works, described as 'más populares que Don Quijote', clearly bewilders Abad Ojuel, who asks rhetorically, '¿es tan interesante saber quién ha matado a un señor, que se necesiten trescientas páginas para describir paso a paso la investigación policíaca?' (p.6). However, such popularity, simply cannot be ignored, incomprehensible as it is, because it translates into hard capital: 'De Conan Doyle a nuestros días los lectores se cuentan por millones y son millones asimismo los que están en juego en el negocio editorial' (p.6). Despite his reservations about the incongruity of a homegrown detective novel, Abad Ojuel's final solution is unequivocally mercantile: 'Por eso es por lo que yo estimularía la producción policíaca nacional. A fin de restringir el mercado a la invasión angloamericana' (p.6).

In response, Herrero strikes a high moral tone: 'La novela policíaca se mueve necesariamente en un mundo de sordidez y bajeza deseducadora. Si nos son exóticos y pegadizos esos tipos de criminales y policías, ¿a qué cultivarles nosotros? Lo hacedero sería echar la inventiva novelesca por otros cauces más en consonancia con nuestros gustos y nuestras realidades' (p.6).

Herrero extrapolates this argument to the publishing industry generally:

*Industrialmente* considerado el asunto, no se puede negar que es negocio más fácil encargar una traducción que un libro original. [...] Pero aquí está el punto delicado de la industria editorial. Producir libros no es producir artículos mecánicos. Los valores culturales, morales, y de toda suerte espirituales que



entran en juego, y los intereses políticos que se ventilan en esa industria, la colocan en categoría aparte dentro del mundo industrial, y derogan las leyes de utilitarismo que exclusivamente rigen en todos los demás negocios.

Por eso no sería mucho pedir a los editores un poco de miramiento en este problema de las traducciones; y no sería nada de extrañar que el Estado, por medio de sus organismos adecuados, tratara de coadyuvar a dar la solución a un problema que cada día se va haciendo más grave. (Emphasis as in original, p.7)

The debate on how to solve the 'problem' of a surfeit of translations thus intersects with the fraught question of the balance between 'quality' versus 'populist' products in the literary market. It was agreed that the high proportion of translations overall was largely attributable to their prevalence in popular sub-genres such as the detective novel (and latterly the serialized adventure story and the comic, discussed below).

At this stage, the institutional powers, here represented by Herrero as head of the *Sección de Ordenación Bibliográfica*, were content to blame the publishers or even the reading public for this state of affairs.<sup>26</sup> Initially, the official solution was merely to foment higher quality patriotic literature by Spanish authors, a posture exemplified by Herrero's speech at the *Fiesta del Libro* of May 1942, which included the following assessment of contemporary Spanish literature:

El libro español valdrá e influirá en el mundo cuando todos los escritores españoles posean una formación auténtica, nutrida de las esencias católicas, morales y caballerescas que informan la civilización cristiana. Sobran los indocumentados, dañan los arrendajos del pensamiento extranjero, estorban los espontáneos, perjudican los versátiles y acomodaticios, no sirven, en suma, los que carecen de auténtica formación española.<sup>27</sup>

However there were those, here represented by Abad Ojuel, who favoured a more pragmatic solution. Realizing that the publishers were highly unlikely to aggravate an already embattled economic predicament out of sheer patriotic fervour, they felt that ideological considerations such as the preservation of a 'higher' cultural ethos should be subordinated to the demands of the market. This meant that instead of attempting forcibly to modify the nation's literary tastes, the authorities should simply engineer the hijacking by Spanish authors of the subgenres in question (perhaps by awarding prizes, advances or subsidies to writers willing to turn their hands to such genres).

The evolution of the orthodox position within this debate reflects the regime's overall movement from a fascist-based, totalitarian conception of itself and society, towards a merely authoritarian, more openly cynical posture. Later, the high moral tone of Herrero's remarks disappears from orthodox proclamations on the matter, as it no doubt became clear that a thoroughgoing policy of cultural manipulation was impossible, since the instruments of control required for the implementation of such a policy simply did not exist in the Francoist state apparatus (see Ridruejo's remarks, p.57, above).

The progressive abandonment of high-cultural considerations and the corresponding ascendancy of an almost exclusively mercantile approach is evident in a June 1945 article on the comic-book boom.<sup>28</sup> Here allusions to quality and pedagogic worth are few, and such questions are explicitly subordinated to the economic benefits of a thriving comic trade: 'La poca importancia bibliográfica que pudieran tener, debido a su aspecto y calidad modestos, está, pues, sobradamente sustituida por la cantidad - una cuestión donde se juega tal capital todos los años no deja de tener su interés' (p.343).

A more overtly defensive declaration of the comic's worth towards the end of the article is more revealing still:

Ha sido criticado este género de publicaciones; pero hablando desapasionadamente, hay que reconocer que está haciendo una labor beneficiosa. Sólo el inducir a un niño a emplear el dinero en lecturas ya es conseguir un triunfo. Más tarde, cuando su apetencia de lector no se sacie con estas menudencias, o cuando no sea apropiado a su edad este entretenimiento, *preferirá* una novela policíaca o de aventuras, que son la causa y origen de estos cuadernos; algo así como sus padres o antepasados. He aquí ya un lector. Una persona que favorecerá a la industria editorial, porque llegará, educada así, a sentir la necesidad imperiosa de leer libros. (p.354)

This is an attempt at a justification of the comic in loosely didactic terms: reading such texts may at least implant the habit of reading in the young, and serve as an introduction to more substantial fare. The movement away from high-cultural concerns towards a more openly market-oriented approach is evident, however. Firstly, there is an unreserved advocacy of the adventure or detective novel as suitable adult reading, contrasting markedly with Herrero's condemnation, at least of the latter type. Secondly, the motives for encouraging the habit of reading at all are openly mercantile: 'He aquí ya un lector. Una persona que *favorecerá a la industria editorial*,

porque llegará, educada así, a sentir la necesidad imperiosa de leer libros' (my emphasis).

The movement away from a culturally elitist position in the face of irresistible market forces does not entail an abandonment of patriotic rhetoric or the siege mentality. It is now implicitly recognized, however, that Spain is competing in the same mass-cultural arena as other producers:

Alguien se cansó de que los héroes, los aventureros, los 'quijotes' de la justicia, los que arriesgan y exponen su vida al servicio de una causa noble fuesen, sin excepción, extranjeros. Parecía ser que los héroes actuales sólo son producto exclusivo de otros climas. Y se nacionalizaron los protagonistas de las adaptaciones, y se crearon nuevos héroes españoles. Nuestra juventud no podía estar admirando eternamente a esos prodigiosos superhombres de fronteras afuera. Aunque fuesen imaginarios y fantásticos, meras creaciones de la mente, hacía falta demostrar a la niñez y a la juventud que España también es capaz de dar aventureros y grandes hombres dignos de admiración y ejemplo de lealtad, heroísmo, valentía, fuerza e ingenio. (pp.346-47)

The appropriation of the superhero genre by Spanish authors is discussed in greater detail below (see p.102). The Barcelona publishers are blamed for the historical dominance of foreign products in the market:

Barcelona, por la fuerza de su primerísima editorial, se ha caracterizado como importadora de originales extranjeros. [...] Las magníficas condiciones de las colecciones extranjeras, que las hicieron famosas, traducéndose a todos los idiomas en las revistas infantiles de países europeos y americanos, lograron imponerse también en España. Y esto - triste es reconocerlo - ha hecho emigrar un capital nada despreciable. (p.352)

Conversely, the Madrid publishers are congratulated for their patient magnanimity in sponsoring undeveloped, and therefore less lucrative, local talent. This protectionism has been made urgently necessary, the article insinuates, by the shamefully unpatriotic free-marketeering of the Republican era, ultimately responsible for the foreign domination: 'Es de destacar la labor indirectamente patriótica de las editoriales madrileñas, que al aceptar trabajos de principiantes, hicieron posible el resurgir del dibujo español, vergonzosamente relegado al olvido por aquella competencia, que data de los tiempos de la República' (p.352).

To summarize, the import of the article on the comic boom is two-fold: it shows firstly that the explicit policy of cultural xenophobia first declared by Herrero in December 1942 is still in place; secondly, the declared motives for such a posture are now openly economic, rather than ostensibly moral, aesthetic or ideological.

Economic protectionism has replaced spiritual or high-cultural protectionism as the dominant orthodox strain in public declarations about the 'excess' of translations.

It would no doubt be too simplistic to posit a neat evolution from a clearly definable 'ideological' early era to a baldly 'mercantile' latter phase in orthodox attitudes to Spanish culture in the 1940s, for the two periods are by no means discrete: both Toral and Cervera's drily pious prescriptions for children's reading (pp.38-44, above) postdate the article on comic-books, a genre neither deigns to mention. A shift towards a less culturally elitist position was encouraged, perhaps even necessitated, however, by the monumental success of José Mallorquí's series of Western adventure stories with Spanish heroes, 'El Coyote'. The scale of this success - one hundred and thirty titles, each selling two hundred and seventy thousand copies, between 1944 and 1951 - made the series impossible to ignore as a phenomenon in children's literature publishing. In *Bibliografía Hispánica's* laudatory article to mark the centenary issue of the series, the slight hint of orthodox unease about the 'low' cultural provenance of 'El Coyote' is more than compensated for by exaltation of its essentially patriotic role in the scheme of children's book publishing, as Nichols succinctly describes:

Before undertaking their report on this pulp fiction, the defenders of high culture at INLE had to head any would-be critics off at the pass. They attack before they can be attacked, telling readers to swallow their intellectual pretensions before judging this phenomenon: 'Hay que desposeerse un poco de tonos doctorales, de posturas de "superioridad intelectual", de envidias y de falsos prejuicios para calibrar la popularidad alcanzada por ese personaje' (*BH*, 9.2 (1950), p.23). Twice they compare *El Coyote* to the *Quijote* in an obvious attempt to bolster the thrillers' respectability. They dwell on the Spanishness of the protagonist and the other characters, on the quintessentially Spanish world view embodied in the plots and dialogues. For Mallorquí, they assert, writing this series 'era como desquitarse varios siglos de leyenda negra'.<sup>29</sup>

By now, no attempt is made to disguise the relish taken in beating the Anglosaxons at their own game: 'Por primera vez, la "manera española" salía a competir con la anglosajona en un terreno de lucha que había sido feudo indiscutible e indiscutido de la misma' (Montañés Fontenla, 1950, p.31). Such effusions would have seemed incongruous, even heretical, in the sanctimonious climate of the early 1940s, when it was felt that such subgenres were simply beneath the dignity of the national scribes.<sup>30</sup>

We have seen that the campaign against translations conducted through the pages of *Bibliografía Hispánica* was particularly centred on genres in which England and America dominated the market, namely crime fiction, adventure stories and comics. Whilst it is true that large numbers of such works were being imported and translated, it is also the case that a remarkable number of translations of more culturally prestigious works were published in Spain during the 1940s. This was largely due to the joint efforts of Walter Starkie at the *Instituto Británico* in Madrid and the anglophile Barcelona publisher José Janés. Janés's activity as a publisher of English literature, rigorously documented by Jacqueline Hurlley (note 23, Chapter 1), is especially noteworthy because he managed to publish works by, amongst others, Winifred Holtby, Radclyffe Hall and Aldous Huxley, which dealt with themes such as adultery, abortion, incest, syphilis, suicide and homosexuality. Even as early as 1943, he had published Radclyffe Hall's *A Note in Music*, which alludes to homosexuality. Such themes were clearly anathema to the fundamentalist Catholics who shaped culture in the early Francoist period. Janés's success in publishing works on or by members of the post-War labour government (Attlee, Cripps, Bevin) is also remarkable given the harsh political climate of the era. This surprisingly liberal approach leads Hurlley to remark that 'uno adquiere a veces la impresión de que la literatura inglesa (puede que otras cuyo sino desconozco también) gozaba vida propia, desconectada de los principios defendidos en altavoz' (p.176).

Hurlley's inference is fair given the evidence she addresses in her book, but by hinting at special treatment for English literature overall, she fails to take into account the crucial importance of the target-readership factor. It is clear that most of the books published by Janés were aimed at a select readership of highly literate bibliophiles. Janés was a publisher in the craftsman tradition, who specifically aimed his books at the cultural elite. He took great pains to ensure that his books were luxury items, objects of physical value. In a publicity leaflet for his collection *Manantial que no cesa*, for example, the publisher specifies that the collection 'va destinada principalmente al público acostumbrado a los libros buenos y bien presentados [...]. Vienen a satisfacer precisamente todas las exigencias del público entendido, y en consecuencia ofrece volúmenes impresos en papel verjurado de alta calidad, de color ligeramente ahuesado, fabricado especialmente para esta colección' (Hurlley, p.149).

Hurtley draws the conclusion that Janés and Starkie's promotion of English literature was possible, despite the stridently xenophobic orthodox proclamations on the translation issue, because the regime's response was limited to mere bluster: 'Fue, claro está, la falta de criterio de "arriba" que permitió a Janés lanzar un extenso panorama de la novelística inglesa contemporánea. La dirección del INLE fue débil en aportar una solución a este grave problema, aplicando parches para guardar las apariencias' (Hurtley, p.161).

The 'parches' in question consisted of official circulars published in *Bibliografía Hispánica*. One reminded publishers that it was their patriotic duty to display 'de manera bien visible y preferente, aquellas obras nacionales cuyo fondo dogmático o de doctrina política, contribuya a la mayor difusión y a la más exaltada loa de las glorias o epopeyas patrias'.<sup>31</sup> Another threatened darkly that a 'criterio restrictivo' would be applied to translated works:

La Vicesecretaría de Educación Popular ha comunicado al INLE para que, por nuestro conducto, sean avisados todos los editores, que ha decidido afrontar el problema de las traducciones con todos los resortes gubernativos que le están encomendados, tanto desde su departamento de Censura de Libros como realizando directamente su propia función rectora sobre los planes semestrales de edición. En su virtud, la Vicesecretaría de Educación Popular ejercerá, desde ahora, en la Censura Previa de libros y en la vigilancia reglamentaria de dichos planes, un criterio restrictivo, muy especialmente en las obras imaginativas, según el cual concederá su aprobación a aquellas traducciones que no sólo se mantengan dentro de una impecable ortodoxia, sino cuya versión pueda justificarse también por su debido mérito literario.<sup>32</sup>

Hurtley concludes that such measures were wholly ineffectual, since 'cantidades elevadas [de traducciones] seguían publicándose, y las voces de protesta oponiéndose' (p.161).

Valeriano Bozal, writing in 1969, tends to concur with Hurtley that the interventionist threats of the regime had little effect on the numbers of translations being published. Collating statistical evidence from *Bibliografía Hispánica*, Bozal reveals that the gross annual figure for translation rights paid by Spanish publishers rose steadily from 237,524 pesetas in 1942 to 2,304,168 in 1946 (Bozal, p.86). Bozal also makes the important observation that the number of translations of literary works made from English, in particular, rose dramatically in the period 1942-1945. Thus although the total number of literary works published annually remained more or less

constant during this period, the number of literary translations from English more than doubled (from 201 in 1942 to 523 in 1945).<sup>33</sup> The figure dropped in the following year (404 in 1946), however, causing Bozal to remark that the norms discriminating against foreign literature 'tuvieron cierta efectividad, como lo indica la disminución habida de 1945 a 1946, motivada también por los problemas de política internacional' (p.87). Relative to the total number of works published, however, literary translations from English dropped a mere four per cent (from 35% in 1945 to 31% in 1946), so that the percentage of total works which were translations from English for 1946 was still almost double that of 1942 (16%). The figure began to rise again in 1948 (32%).

*It is clear, then, that even if the campaign against translations generally did have some effect, English literature enjoyed remarkable prosperity in the Spain of the 1940s. It will be remembered that various external forces exerted influence on the Spanish publishing trade with respect to English literature in this period. English culture generally was vigorously promoted by Starkie and anglophiles such as Janés, and the regime had a vested interest in favouring the culture of the Allies from 1942 onwards (see pp.26, 80, above). On the other hand, the regime was ideologically ill-disposed towards the victors of the War, and from 1946 onwards adopted an isolationist posture.*

*The statistics show that the urge towards isolation did have a specific impact on the area of culture, as the fall in translations from English from 1945 to 1946 demonstrates. The very high number of translated English books published in Spain during the mid-1940s generally suggests that the factors militating in favour of English literature were more powerful than the regime's declared isolationism, however. This tends to confirm Hurtle's assertion that the regime's chief priority in this era was 'una resolución política de congraciarse con los vencedores de 1945 a 1946, y de no quemar todas las naves a partir de la recomendación de las Naciones Unidas en diciembre de 1946' (Hurtle, p.176).*

### Part III: The Censorship of Children's Literature

#### (i) Introduction

In this section, the specific mechanisms the regime used to control children's literature are examined. A powerful argument for considering the censorship of children's literature, particularly, as a phenomenon distinct from Francoist censorship as a whole is the fact that a series of additional laws governed the production and distribution of children's books. An *Oficio* issued by the *Vicesecretaría de Educación Popular* in 1943 established that books for children should be 'rigurosamente edificantes y pedagógicos', specifying that:

Solamente deben publicarse aquellos cuadernos en los que se reconozca un notable valor educativo, para lo cual los editores deberán seguir la tendencia de buscar argumentos en la literatura popular española o de la antigüedad clásica y, en general, sobre temas heroicos y morales.<sup>34</sup>

It will be noted that this piece of legislation is rather less passive than Article Eighteen of the *Ley de Prensa* of 1938, in that it *prescribes* rather than merely *proscribes*. Although the requirement that children's books should have a 'notable valor educativo' reflects the usual Francoist vagueness, it still constitutes a positive definition which is lacking in the passive legislation applied to adult literature. The rather more specific prescription of folkloric, classical, heroic or moral subject matter confirms the impression that the regime's approach to the censorship of children's literature was more totalitarian, at least in intent, than was the case for censorship generally, in which an essentially self-protective and authoritarian posture prevailed.

The prescribed subjects, it should be noted in passing, also reveal the additional patriotic bias in legislation for children's literature. Generally, the permitted categories of subject matter reflect the urge to prevent the child from being exposed to any rival practices, ideologies or world views. Both this additional patriotic bias and the imposition of a higher degree of orthodoxy in all areas are apparent in the prescriptions for schoolbooks used to teach reading and writing:

Libros de iniciación a la lectura y escritura: Habrán de desenvolver, en sus ejemplos, temas religiosos, patrióticos y del Movimiento, sin exclusión de ninguno de ellos. La parte gráfica responderá a lo expuesto, no debiendo faltar la bandera de España, las del Movimiento y los retratos del Caudillo y de José Antonio.<sup>35</sup>



The fact that the regime should publish a norm imposing strict orthodoxy on, specifically, the very first texts that the child would begin to understand, and indeed produce, is confirmation that the ideologists believed in the efficacy of indoctrination as early as possible (see p.16, above).

The patriotic bias in the regime's children's book legislation is also evident in the norms relating to books for the teaching of history and language:

No puede faltar la exposición de los puntos siguientes: el cristianismo, formación de la nacionalidad, reinado de los Reyes Católicos, exaltando su obra de unidad, Carlos I y Felipe II, el Imperio español y sus notas características y espirituales, la evangelización de América, la labor misionera de España en el mundo, la Inquisición, el desmembramiento del Imperio como obra de la masonería, terminando con el Movimiento Nacional, principales hechos y figuras, exponiendo las biografías del Caudillo y de José Antonio.

In a more insidious fashion, patriotic sentiments were to be inculcated through Spanish grammar books, in which 'deben figurar temas religiosos, patrióticos y del Movimiento, en forma de frases, ejemplos, fragmentos de discursos, poesías, etc., de manera graduada'.<sup>36</sup>

It is important to point out, however, that although the early legislation generally reveals an urge to control children's literature more strictly, certain aspects of it also indicate a recognition on the part of the regime that this was unlikely to be entirely possible. Firstly, publishers were obliged merely to '*seguir la tendencia de buscar argumentos*' of an orthodox type. In falling short of stipulating that *all* children's books should obey the prescriptions, the authors of the law were no doubt recognizing that the publishing industry had to be given considerable leeway to make its own rules, determined by the demands of the market.

Further evidence is provided by a government order issued in March 1944, in which it was established that the *Delegaciones Provinciales de Educación Popular* would ensure that 'la literatura destinada a los niños tenga carácter educativo o, por lo menos, inocuo a este respecto, vigilando especialmente textos que se refieren a la Historia de España y al sentido de nuestra cultura' (Cendán Pazos, p.53). Although the provincial authorities were only responsible for censoring works of less than thirty-two pages, this norm is nevertheless significant in the context of children's literature, in which a relatively high number of works would fall into this category. It would have applied, particularly, to comics and pull-out comic sections in newspapers, which

enjoyed increasing popularity from the 1940s onwards (pp.77-79, above). The qualification that books could be merely 'inocuo en este respecto', and the self-protective character of the areas singled out for special rigour, strike a markedly less dictatorial note than the actively prescriptive norm of 1943.

The comparatively greater degree of intervention in the area of children's literature should not be understated, however. It will be recalled that the campaign against translated literature had only a small impact on the large numbers of literary works by English authors being published in Spain in the 1940s (see pp.80-82, above). Nichols's analysis of *Bibliografía Hispánica's* monthly bibliography of children's works, summarized in the table below, suggests that the impact on children's literature was considerably greater:

Year	% of Children's Works by Spanish Authors
1942	27%
1943	31%
1950	53%
1942-51	43% (average)

(Nichols, p.217)

#### (ii) The 1956 *Reglamento*

Further evidence of the regime's greater intervention in children's literature is the fact that in 1952, at a time when the regime had been trying to soften its image and distance itself from fascism for some seven years, the new *Ministerio de Información y Turismo* under Arias Salgado created a body specifically dedicated to the control of children's literature (Cendán Pazos, pp.53-54). The *Junta Asesora de Prensa Infantil*, as its name suggests, was originally concerned only with the regulation of the comic trade, once again confirming the regime's preoccupation with this new mass-circulation medium. The *Junta's* specific task was to report on the state of the industry, paying particular attention to the educational value and orthodoxy of texts. In 1954, the *Junta's* responsibilities were extended to cover all children's texts, which were defined as 'todas las publicaciones que, bien por su forma externa, su contenido o por el

público al que iban destinadas, pudieran considerarse adecuadas para los niños y los adolescentes' (Cendán Pazos, p.54). Schoolbooks, which as we have seen were already governed by a strict norm regarding their orthodox content (p.83, above) were explicitly excluded from this definition, since they were the responsibility of the *Ministerio de Educación*, not the *Ministerio de Información y Turismo*. The composition of the *Junta*, explicitly defined in a ministerial decree of 1955, reflected the hierarchy of social groups entrusted with the socialization and moral welfare of children:

La Junta Asesora de Publicaciones Infantiles estará compuesta por un representante de la Comisión Episcopal de Ortodoxia y Moralidad, dos del Ministerio de Educación Nacional, libremente designados éstos por el titular del Departamento, y cuatro vocales cabezas de familia o personas de reconocida competencia en la materia.<sup>37</sup>

The *Junta's* definition of the children's book was further clarified in the same decree. Children's books were divided into three distinct categories. It should be noted that these definitions were somewhat circular, thus allowing the *Junta* to describe almost anything it liked as a children's book. Thus the third category, 'por el público al que iban destinadas' is further 'defined' as works:

- a) Para niños
- b) Para niñas
- c) Para niños y niñas
- d) Para adolescentes del sexo masculino
- e) Para adolescentes del sexo femenino

(Cendán Pazos, p.56)

The specific characteristics which might qualify a text for membership of one of these five sub-categories were not established. The breadth of the Francoist definition of children's literature should be noted in passing, however: for the purposes of the *Junta*, children's literature included books for adolescents (normally alluded to as 'literatura juvenil', as opposed to 'literatura infantil'). This definition thus potentially included works such as *Tom Sawyer*, whose equivocal status as a children's book bears crucially on the censorship imposed on it, as we shall see in Chapter 3.

It is significant that the first category within the definition of children's literature is 'en función de su forma externa'. This merely descriptive definition of a children's book as, bluntly, anything that looks like one, again reveals the pragmatism of the regime. By implanting such a flexible criterion, the regime established its right

to subject any work *marketed* as a children's book to the stricter norms which applied to such books, irrespective of whether its contents suggested it as a work for children. This potentially allowed for two distinct editions of the same work to be judged differently, depending merely on the target-readership suggested by the packaging. The regime thus preempted the possibility of a publisher objecting that a work had already been deemed ideologically harmless in a previous edition (see p.155, below, for an example of such a claim). Since the new legislation explicitly designated children's literature as an area of special rigour, any edition which fulfilled its very general criteria for inclusion had to abide by its particular rules.

These rules were set out in a special *Reglamento*, published some seven months later.<sup>38</sup> The norms, which were to be observed 'con todo rigor' by all publishers of children's texts, were divided into five sections: 'respecto a la religión'; 'respecto a la moral'; 'desde los puntos de vista psicológicos y educativos'; 'atendiendo a los aspectos patrióticos y políticos'; and 'desde los puntos de vista literarios, artísticos y técnicos' (Cendán Pazos, pp.56-59). The discussion below points up those aspects of the *Reglamento* which are especially relevant to the present dissertation. The section headings of the analysis below correspond to the thematic concerns of the present dissertation, rather than to the original divisions enumerated above.

#### (A) Religion

The first of the five categories of prohibition concerns religion. Items 1(a) and 1(b) proscribe any deviant reference to the dogma, ritual or priests of, specifically, the Catholic Church. The primacy of this taboo reflects, once again, the overwhelmingly powerful influence of the Church in matters relating to children during the Franco era.

Item 1(d) prohibits overt or 'tendentious' references to other religious confessions 'que puedan conducir a error o a escándalo'. As will become apparent below, this norm has a crucial bearing on the censors' response to *Tom Sawyer* and the *William* books, both of which contain episodes in which Protestant clergymen figure prominently (see Chapter 4, below).

## (B) Sexuality

The second and largest category relates to morality generally. The first item establishes a vague, umbrella criterion which might be invoked if the offending material could not be faulted on more specific grounds: 'los dibujos o descripciones que puedan excitar morbosamente la sensibilidad de los niños y adolescentes'.

Items 2(b) to 2(d) all establish, more or less directly, the orthodox doctrine of sexuality with respect to children's literature. Item (b) prohibits reference to unorthodox forms of love. Interestingly, only material which exalts divorce or presents it as natural is explicitly defined as proscribable. This potentially leaves room for reference to divorce, as long as such reference tended to condemn the practice. The mere presence, then, of an 'adult' theme such as divorce in children's literature, was apparently not considered inappropriate, as long as the propaganda pointed in the right direction.

This is despite the fact that Item 3(e) (from the next category, 'desde los puntos de vista psicológicos y educativos') makes explicit allusion to a childish world from which certain themes are banished, forbidding 'asuntos que no pertenezcan al mundo del niño'. The example chosen to illustrate such a topic is significant, however: 'tales como infidelidades conyugales y otros semejantes'.

The explanation for the apparent contradiction between Items 2(b) and 3(b) lies in the hypocrisy which obtained throughout the Franco period. Inevitably, given the powerful fundamentalist Catholic component of Francoism, marriage was presented as an inviolable institution, and as a social duty. Pressure to marry was accompanied by the stigmatization of all sensual indulgence, however. Marriage was thus construed as a purely spiritual union in the sight of God, in which sex should be dutifully but shamefully undertaken solely for the purpose of perpetuating the race. The repression this generated gave rise to certain peripheral social phenomena, as Tejada explains:

En los años de la posguerra, el novio celtibérico, machote y agresivo, advertía muy pronto que en su 'santa' novia y futura 'santa' esposa no encontraría jamás el desahogo sexual que necesitaba perentoriamente. En consecuencia, recurría a otros aliviaderos - la prostitución o la masturbación - también inmorales y condenados desde una perspectiva doctrinal, pero que en la práctica gozaban de mayor tolerancia. (Tejada, p.76)

Prostitution grew up as a tolerated form of sexual relief, then, because of the contradictory orthodoxy with respect to the sexuality of both men and women. The

product of a profoundly chauvinistic society, the Spanish male was expected, on one level, to exhibit a 'healthy', predatory sexual urge. On another level, the moral and political orthodoxy of the era dictated that he should suppress his libido, and sublimate his desires in religious and patriotic fervour. The Spanish woman was caught in a similarly cleft stick: exhorted to conform to 'an "ideal" image of womanhood as "eternal", passive, pious, pure, submissive woman-as-mother for whom self-denial was the only road to real fulfilment' (Graham, p.184), she was simultaneously encouraged to procreate as frequently as possible, in the interests of the Spanish 'race'.

Institutionalized repression has to be controlled, however: it must be sufficient to perform its repressive function, but at the same time it cannot be so harsh as to provoke rebellion. Though prostitution evidently served as an escape valve to some extent in the Franco era, it was the institution of the *querida* or mistress which became most firmly established as a legitimate means of alleviating sexual tension:

Decía el escritor Edgar Neville que en España tener amante no sólo se considera inevitable, sino que está bien visto. Lo que ya no se tolera es la segunda amante. Eso es un deshonor, una necedad, que hace que los bancos empiecen a retirarle a uno el crédito. Porque la amante, la otra, también tiene sus derechos, como una contraesposa. (Tejada, p.36)

The tacit approval of prostitution and the institution of the mistress as a means of sexual relief closed the circle of shame around the Spanish male of the era: unable to fulfil his desires in marriage, he resorted to an activity (infidelity of one sort or another) explicitly condemned by the Scriptures. Increased public conformity to orthodox practices was no doubt one way of assuaging his private guilt.

A key difference between infidelity and divorce in the orthodox ideological scheme, therefore, was simply that the former existed and the latter did not. Divorce might therefore be mentioned in a child setting, since where it did exist it was a purely legal institution, and as such could be unambiguously proscribed by the regime in its role as legislator. The taking of a mistress, on the other hand, was not only unpreventable in practical terms, it was also a necessary custom if the subtle tensions of Francoist sexual repression were to be kept in equilibrium.

The institution of the mistress therefore constituted a tacit admission of the system's failure, a recognition that the levels of self-abnegation required by the official dogma were incompatible with the human libido. Any suggestion that the system was

tainted in this way had to be kept from the populace, and most of all from its most impressionable sector.

Item 2(c) proscribes 'toda descripción que pueda despertar una curiosidad malsana en orden a la fisiología de la generación'. The National-Catholic fear of the corporeal could hardly be more bluntly expressed. Curiosity on the part of the child concerning its own origins is simply viewed as a symptom of ill-health. Nor is this 'illness' of a purely spiritual or figurative nature: the link between sensual indulgence and mental or even physical dysfunction was often made quite literally, as Tejada explains:

La clase médica oficial - según Amando de Miguel 'uno de los sustratos ideológicos más reaccionarios' - ha respaldado con afirmaciones de grueso calibre que el erotismo suele ser la causa de nuestros males nacionales, de nuestro fracaso en los deportes, en los estudios y en la familia, y que su represión nunca produce neurosis. (Tejada, pp.25-26)

The orthodox posture with respect to sexual curiosity is further illustrated by the regime's hostile response to the 1960s boom in medical texts which propounded the thesis that sexual liberty, achieved through demystification of the subject by frank discussion, is essential to the healthy functioning of the individual (Cisquella, p.81).

The wording of item 2(d) reiterates this orthodox equation of physical love with the base and sinful, prohibiting 'los relatos en que el amor sea tratado con excesivo realismo, sin la indispensable idealidad y delicadeza, y los cuentos que ofrezcan crudeza de expresión o dibujo que puedan calificarse de inmorales'. The ambivalent orthodox posture concerning the degree of reality to which the child should be exposed has already been discussed above (pp.36-45). Here, with respect to sexuality, it is clear that everything should be done to keep children from knowing the 'brutal' truth about love, namely that it finds expression through carnal acts.

The implications of the use of the words 'realismo' and 'tratar' are considerable: there is an admission that the *reality* of the matter (love) is unpalatably physical, and that it is only by *treating* this reality in some way, that is by superimposing a veneer of spirituality ('la indispensable idealidad y delicadeza'), that it can be made acceptable.

In order to clarify this point, we might consider an alternative wording for the item in question: 'se evitarán los relatos en que se dé del amor una presentación

equivoca, resaltando el elemento puramente físico en menoscabo del indispensable componente espiritual'. This formula, or something like it, would have suggested a genuine conviction in the *reality* of love as an essentially spiritual phenomenon. The formula as it stands lays bare the extent to which 'immorality' is merely an aesthetic matter for the regime: love is a shamefully brutal business in reality, the ideologists seem to be saying, but things will be all right if one pretends otherwise in public.

### (C) Society and Behaviour

Items 2(e) and 2(f) establish orthodoxy in the realm of the social and behavioural:

2(e) [Se evitarán] las novelas o relatos policíacos y de aventuras en los que se exalte el odio, la agresividad y la venganza; aquellos en que aparezca atrayente la figura del criminal u ofrezca a la imitación de los pequeños lectores las técnicas del robo, el fraude, la mentira, la astucia, la hipocresía y el bandidaje.

2(f) [Se evitará] cuanto implique directa o indirectamente la exaltación del suicidio, la eutanasia, el alcoholismo, la venganza, la toxicomanía y demás plagas sociales.

The primacy of 'el odio' as a proscribed category is significant. In fact, one of the cornerstones of the Francoist social creed was hatred: hatred of socialists and communists, hatred of masons, hatred of non-Catholics, hatred of foreigners. This was logical, since as Sopeña remarks, hatred had been the initial driving force of the rebel uprising which had led to the Civil War: 'La pulsión primera del Alzamiento era el odio; y la finalidad esencial, la destrucción' (Sopeña, p.224). The regime's aspiration, however, was to homogenize Spanish society so that social revolution in a democratic direction became increasingly less possible.

In the early years of Francoism when the *Reglamento* was being drawn up, the most brutal repression against the losers of the Civil War had only just begun to subside. Preston reveals that guerrilla warfare only came to an end in 1951, and adds that 'it was hardly surprising, therefore, that the several "families" or political groups which made up the Francoist alliance were held together by a fear that any relaxation of institutionalized repression might lead to renewed Civil War and acts of revenge by their victims' (Preston, 1986, p.4). It thus continued to be necessary for the regime to suppress explicit expressions of factional hatred, in order to shore up the implicit claim that the defeat of the Left was a natural consequence of Spain's historic destiny,



rather than a victory for mere brute force. This political motive for suppressing hatred was complemented by the necessity of condemning it from the point of view of Catholic doctrine.

As noted, the winners of the war continued to take revenge on the losers in savage fashion until the 1950s. In a certain sense, the entire regime could be described as an institutionalized revenge on Republican Spain (*Franco*, pp.210, 316). As with hatred, any acknowledgement of vengeance as a motor force in the establishment and consolidation of the regime had to be strenuously avoided, since such sentiments ran contrary to Catholic teaching, and would betray the regime's irrational basis. 'La venganza' thus appears as a proscribed category in both Items 2(e) and (f).

Item (b) in section four, which addresses the wider social scheme of children's works ('los aspectos patrióticos y políticos'), reasserts this suppression of factionalism. Here, however, the motive for such suppression - that is, the perpetuation of a rigid class hierarchy - is more explicitly revealed: 'Los autores se abstendrán de fomentar, directa o indirectamente, sentimientos de odio, envidia, rencor o venganza entre las clases sociales.'

The need to contain resentment between social classes was a concern parallel to that of suppressing animosity between ideological factions: both were potential catalysts of national upheaval. Moreover, the two problematic groups - the poor and those with socialist leanings - were largely overlapping, as Paul Preston explains:

A system of safe-conducts and certificates of political reliability made travel and the search for work extremely difficult. It thus turned those of the defeated who escaped prison or execution into second-class citizens.

The lower classes were thus forced to bear the cost of economic policies aimed at rewarding the regime's forces for their wartime support. (Preston, 1986, p.6)

As with hatred, the prohibition of revenge between individuals or factions is relevant to the regime's overall attitude towards the *William* series and *Tom Sawyer*, both of which contain prominent allusions to vengeful sentiments on the part of children.

The other prohibited categories in Items 2(e) and 2(f) reflect the regime's concern with law and order. Crimes against property, in particular, were to be discouraged ('el robo, el fraude [...] el bandidaje'). In accordance with the regime's promotion of austerity, once again, and of optimism or enthusiasm (pp.15-16, above),

any recognition of the morbid dimension of the human character was also to be excluded from literature for children ('el suicidio, la eutanasia, el alcoholismo, la toxicomanía').

Relatedly, various items in the third section ('desde los puntos de vista psicológicos y educativos') promote a wholesome, 'luminous' conception of existence. Item 3(a) prohibits 'las escenas terroríficas o de cualquier otra índole que puedan afectar profundamente el equilibrio psicológico del niño'. This criterion seems to have been applied highly selectively in practice. Generally, scenes of graphic violence were deemed permissible as long as they tended to exalt some National-Catholic ideal such as Christian sacrifice. The question of violence in children's literature under Franco is discussed in greater detail in Chapter 7.

Romanticization of the figure of the criminal is specifically condemned in Item 3(c) ('novelas o relatos [...] en que aparezca atrayente la figura del criminal'). Such romanticization is a commonplace of the adventure-story for boys, and is a feature of both the *William* books and *Tom Sawyer*. The regime's response to romanticized portrayals of criminal behaviour in the principal works is also discussed in detail in Chapter 7.

The inviolability of the interconnecting hierarchies of family and social order is established in Item 2(g): 'Se evitará [...] toda desviación del humorismo hacia la ridiculización de la autoridad de los padres, de la Santidad de la familia y del hogar, del respeto a las personas que ejercen autoridad, del amor a la patria y de la obediencia a las leyes'.

The reasons for installing a vertical politico-social system are even more explicitly expounded in Item 3(b):

[Deberán evitarse]: Los relatos que presenten a una luz favorable las reacciones antisociales, bien porque muestren el éxito logrado poniendo en juego los mecanismos de agresión al margen de las leyes, bien porque den de lo social una versión tendenciosa y errónea, a base de 'grupos o partidas' en que se acumulen los instintos vindicativos de sus componentes y las posibilidades de triunfo amoral.

The second part of this Item ('bien porque den de lo social [...]') amounts to a full-frontal attack on democratic notions of social organization. The orthodox conception of society as an immutable vertical structure is confirmed by its reiteration, in balder form, in Item 4(b): '[Los autores se abstendrán de] fomentar, directa o

indirectamente, sentimientos de odio, envidia, rencor o venganza entre las clases sociales.'

This explicit rejection of class rivalry is particularly relevant to the *William* series, in which both envy and social factionalism are used as a source of humour. Moreover, in both the *William* books and *Tom Sawyer*, the satirical targets are almost always the socially ambitious, or self-important figures of petty authority, as will become clear in Chapter 6.

#### (D) Irony

The Items of the *Reglamento* which reflect the inviolability of hierarchical structures also imply a parallel characteristic of Francoist orthodoxy: its absolute incompatibility with irony and satire (see pp.15-16, above). In order to apprehend the ironical and satirical, it is necessary to recognise the possibility of relative viewpoints. The notion of relative claims to truth, evidently, contradicts the essence of totalitarianism, as is demonstrated in Item 3(b), discussed above.

The ironical and satirical are indirectly proscribed in Item 3(d):

[Debería evitarse] un sentido del humor demasiado cerebral y escéptico para ser infantil, con desconocimiento u olvido del candor y la ingenuidad en que se fundamenta el sentido infantil de la ironía.

This prohibition may not be thought especially unreasonable: the literary and intellectual sophistication required to understand irony may seem to exclude it naturally as an appropriate element of children's literature. Both the *William* books and *Tom Sawyer*, however, are quintessential examples of an important dictum regarding children's literature: that many children's books are not for children alone. Both works are effective on multiple levels of sophistication. Children with only a very slightly developed sense of literary play can enjoy William or Tom's escapades through an almost completely frank identification with the protagonist. Layers of irony can then be discerned as literary understanding develops, from the appreciation of multiple perceptions of the same situation (a common device in the *William* series particularly) to the full-blown satirical evocation of the stories' social milieu.

Certain items alluding to the protagonists of children's books and their relation to the social scheme also demonstrate a keen attention to irony on the part of the censors. Item 4(i) adds a nuance to the scheme suggested in 4(e), according to which

conformity should always be encouraged and subversion opposed: '[Se evitarán] relatos en los que se ensalce la aparente bondad del niño que finge sumisión, o se condene la rebeldía del que se opone a la injusticia.' What this item foresees is the possibility of apparent conformity disguising ironical intent, or of conformity to some false doctrine (in the regime's eyes) resulting in injustice (Franco's forces were, it should be remembered, 'the rebels' of the Civil War). This grasp of the possibility of inverted schemes demonstrates the ideologists' alertness to the sophistications of irony. Such inversions are frequent in the *William* books particularly, a fact which no doubt contributed to orthodox discomfort with the series, discussed in Chapter 3.

Item 2(h) reiterates the point made in 2(e), that the didactic scheme of the children's work must be unequivocal:

[Se evitarán] narraciones o dibujos en las que se hace triunfar al protagonista perverso e indisciplinado, pero dotado de fuerza, astucia o doblez.

This Item is clearly relevant to the regime's response to the *William* books and *Tom Sawyer*, for whilst 'perverso' would be a harsh description of either of the eponymous protagonists, both are frequently undisciplined, often sly, and regularly use dissimulation to achieve mischievous ends.

What is most remarkable about the *Reglamento* is that it constitutes a far more explicit and detailed declaration of ideology than can be found elsewhere in published Francoist censorship texts of its era. The regime's intense preoccupation with the inculcation of its ideology in the New Race is revealed by the sophistication and detail of the children's literature norms, which demonstrate a far greater awareness of literary features such as implicitness, point of view and the mechanisms of narrative than the Francoist censorship apparatus is generally thought to have possessed.

Whether this sophistication was carried over into censorship practice is, of course, another matter. The evidence suggests that those responsible for the day-to-day censorship of texts were frequently not especially sensitive to irony, or indeed any other kind of artistic subtlety. Hurtley cites the case of Radclyffe Hall's *The Unlit Lamp*, the censor of which 'no alude en el resumen de su informe a la latente pasión lesbiana entre Joan y Elizabeth'. Hurtley further remarks that 'el censor demuestra que no entendió bien la novela al no distinguir entre el sentimiento totalmente egoísta de la madre y la dedicación altruista que le manifiesta la institutriz' (Hurtley, p.198).

Gubern refers to a similar case of blindness on the part of the censors, who completely failed to detect the undercurrents of homosexuality in Luis María Delgado's 1961 film *Diferente* (Gubern, p.168). In the discussion of the texts in succeeding chapters of this dissertation, however, it will become clear that the censors were especially wary of, and therefore sensitive to, irony in books for children (see pp.136, 141, 252, below).

The regime's preoccupation with the child is even more apparent when one considers that detailed norms for censorship of the cinema were not drawn up until 1963. Generally, cinema was even more feared by the regime than literature, because of its indiscriminate mass audience and power to absorb the spectator by appealing to base instincts, causing one cinema censor to allude to 'los reparos que al espectáculo como tal puede hacerse por el predominio que en él ejercen las fuerzas bajas de los sentidos sobre la inteligencia, que adormecida por aquéllos, pierde el mando del individuo' (Gubern, p.65).

The regime's awareness of the power of the cinema is further reflected in its investment in the medium for direct propaganda purposes, which included the perennial NO-DO bulletins, and the production of fascist-style films glorifying the Civil War, culminating in Franco's own creation, *Raza*.<sup>39</sup> The regime's policy on cinema censorship lays bare, however, the contradictions of its cultural policy as a whole. Though various protectionist mechanisms were installed, such as import licences only being granted to producers who had made patriotic Spanish films (Gubern, p.79), the self-protective nature of Francoist censorship militated against domestic films, since these were much more likely to address, or even inadvertently reveal, deficiencies in Spanish society (Gubern, pp.140-41). Domestic products also suffered the additional intervention of prior censorship of the script, before the film was shot at all, causing many in the industry to complain that foreign films were clearly favoured by the system.

As in the case of literature, the arbitrariness of film censorship was a source of constant frustration to practitioners in the industry. Cinema's mass audience, the greater conspicuousness of film censorship, and the presence of the dynamic José María García Escudero as *Director General de Cinematografía y Teatro* were all

factors in the regime's decision to publish specific guidelines for film of a type which did not exist for adult literature (Gubern, pp.193-97).

Gubern's summary of the norms the regime produced reveals that the specific prohibitions of the *Orden Ministerial* of 9 February 1963 governing film censorship coincide substantially with those the regime had already installed for children's literature:

El texto de estas normas contemplaba una variedad de aspectos religiosos, morales, socio-políticos y aun estéticos (los atentados al 'buen gusto'), prohibiéndose expresamente en ellas la justificación del suicidio, del homicidio por piedad, de la venganza y del duelo, del divorcio, del adulterio, de las relaciones sexuales ilícitas, de la prostitución, del aborto y de los métodos anticonceptivos, la presentación de perversiones sexuales, de la toxicomanía, del alcoholismo y de los delitos excesivamente pormenorizados, así como las escenas de brutalidad o crueldad, las ofensas a la religión, a la Iglesia católica, a los principios fundamentales del Estado y a la persona del jefe del Estado. (Gubern, p.195)

Children's literature can thus lay claim to being the first area of culture whose control the regime felt to be so important - or so self-evidently necessary - that it was prepared to publish an explicit declaration of ideology. The ideological principles contained in this declaration then served as a prototype for the regulation of the other medium which the regime viewed as increasingly important in terms of its impact on the populace, the cinema. This confirmation of the preeminent status of children's literature amongst the regime's cultural preoccupations is further evidence of the totalitarian urge to secure the perpetuation of the National-Catholic ideology by passing it on to successive generations.

### (iii) The 1967 *Estatuto*

Children's literature legislation during the second half of the regime demonstrates that the ideologists remained convinced of the need for continued rigour in this area, despite the overall tendency towards liberalization during the 1950s and 1960s. The principal indication of this is the regime's decision to retain obligatory prior censorship for all children's books in the *Ley de Prensa e Imprenta* of 1966. Article Fifteen of the Law established that: 'Un Estatuto especial regulará la impresión, edición y difusión de publicaciones que, por su carácter, objeto o presentación, aparezcan como principalmente destinadas a los niños y adolescentes' (Beneyto, p.419).

The *Estatuto de Publicaciones Infantiles y Juveniles* duly came into force on 19 January 1967, replacing the 1956 *Reglamento* as the legal instrument governing children's books. The 1967 *Estatuto* is essentially a simplified version of the *Reglamento* of 1956, but the wording of the prohibitions it contains, and the order in which they are presented, reflects the changes of emphasis the regime had been obliged to adopt in the intervening period.<sup>40</sup>

Article Eight of the 1967 *Estatuto* established that children's works should emphasise 'el respeto a los valores religiosos, morales, políticos y sociales que inspiran la vida española'. Here the order of listed values corresponds to the overall hierarchy which had always prevailed in censorship practice, and which was evident in the 1956 *Reglamento*. In the separate sections of Article Nine which define the prohibitions in detail, however, a different hierarchy of values is evident. Section (a) proscribes exaltation of immoral or criminal activity in children's works. Section (b) prohibits descriptions of the odd assortment of 'social ills' which reflect the National-Catholic world view ('el terror, la violencia, el sadismo, el erotismo, el suicidio, la eutanasia, el alcoholismo, la toxicomanía o demás taras sociales'). These sections summarize Section Two of the 1956 *Reglamento*, which came under the heading 'respecto a la moral'. Significantly, however, Items 2(a) to 2(d) of the 1956 legislation, which referred to sexual morality in children's literature, are reduced to a single category 'el erotismo' in the 1967 *Estatuto*.

More significantly still, however, in the 1967 law these 'socio-moral' taboos have supplanted unorthodox religious content in children's works as the first category of prohibition to be described. Furthermore, Section (c) of the 1967 law has a decidedly more liberal ring than its equivalent in the 1956 *Reglamento* (Section One), since it refers to injurious descriptions of the practices or adherents of *any* religious confession.

These shifts in emphasis reflect, on the one hand, the necessity and the will to appear progressive in an era in which appearances were becoming increasingly important, as the regime sought to placate both an ever more restive populace and the nation's foreign sponsors. On the other hand, the promotion of the 'socio-moral' concerns above the defence of organized religion illustrates the subtle shift away from

the strongly theocratic, 'spiritualist' pretensions of the early regime, towards a bland authoritarianism with religious undertones.

Relatedly, the dilution of the explicitly religious category of prohibition, so that it no longer exclusively defended Catholicism, reflects the diminution of the Catholic Church's influence amongst the regime's power elite. The abolition of the exclusive status of Catholicism as a sacrosanct religious institution in the censorship of children's literature can also be seen as a further implicit admission that the principal goal of the censors was to inculcate conformity. As we shall see in Chapter 4, the censors of children's books habitually suppressed mockery of non-Catholic confessions (in practice, Protestantism), but their stated reasons for doing so changed over time. The explicit prohibition of all religious mockery in the 1967 law marks this shift of emphasis from the absolute assertion of Catholicism as the only mentionable religious faith, in the early years, to the implicit admission that what was important was unquestioning faith in, and obedience to, religious authority of whatever kind. It should be added, however, that although *mockery* of all religions was theoretically proscribed, the typically vague prohibition at the end of Section (c) could no doubt be used as a pretext for suppressing *favourable* descriptions of non-Catholic confessions: '[Habrá de evitarse] escenas o argumentos que puedan implicar desviación del recto sentido religioso'.

Section 9(d) of the *Estatuto* is essentially an ellision of Items 2(e) and 3(b) of the *Reglamento*. As well as proscribing hatred, revenge and falsehood, however, the new statute included a new category of prohibition in this area, of '[el] culto desproporcionado y ambicioso de la propia personalidad'. Once again, the addition of self-aggrandizement as a prohibited category of allusion seems to reveal a growing urge to remind the populace of its passive and subservient role in the scheme of things.

Also notable is the absence from the 1967 *Estatuto* of any mention of irony or humour. It will be recalled that the 1956 *Reglamento* included carefully worded proscriptions of narratives which tended to have the effect of condoning or rewarding indiscipline and the use of force or cunning, or which condemned rebellion in a justifiable (orthodox) cause (Items 2(h) and (i)). The 1967 law contains no such allusions to point of view in literary works for children. More tellingly, the



*Reglamento's* explicit condemnations of humour derived from the mockery of authority, and of 'cerebral' or 'sceptical' humour (Items 2(g) and 3(d)) have no equivalent in the *Estatuto*. As we shall see in Chapter 3, the regime's attitude to irony in children's books became somewhat less hostile, at least in the case of certain texts, as the regime was forced to abandon the culturally isolationist pretensions of its earliest years.

Finally, with regard to the 1967 *Estatuto*, it is important to point out a technical stipulation in the new law which was to have significant implications for the publishers of children's books in the Fraga period and beyond:

Todas aquellas [publicaciones] a que este Estatuto se refiere habrán de hacer constar en portada y en forma destacada inmediatamente encima o debajo del título y con un tipo de letra de tamaño no inferior a la mitad del utilizado para éste la categoría a que corresponden dentro de las señalados en el artículo cinco.

The categorizations established in Article Five were as follows:

- a) Publicaciones infantiles: aquellas que se destinen exclusivamente a menores de catorce años.
- b) Publicaciones juveniles: aquellas que se destinen exclusivamente a mayores de catorce años y menores de dieciocho.
- c) Publicaciones infantiles y juveniles: aquellas que se destinen indistintamente a un público lector de edad inferior a dieciocho años.

The new law thus established a system of explicit classification according to the recommended age of the readership, not unlike that used in the case of films in many Western countries today. Censorship was thus presented as a public service to assist parents, librarians and booksellers in choosing books appropriate to particular age groups. As we shall see in Chapter 3, however, this stipulation was also used as a means of embroiling publishers in lengthy negotiations concerning the precise classification of particular works or editions. This particularly applied to works such as *Tom Sawyer*, whose categorization could vary according to the degree of adaptation and the presentation of a given edition.

#### (iv) Censorship Practice in the Area of Children's Literature

Moving from the sphere of legislation to that of Francoist censorship practice in the area of children's literature, it is fair to say that the published evidence is thus far scarce and anecdotal. Georgina Cisquella and her co-authors report that the head of

the censorship of children's literature under Fraga was a Dominican Friar named Padre Vázquez (Cisquella, p.96). The authors report that Vázquez was considered 'más estricto [...] que el propio Faustino Sánchez Marín' (p.97), the latter being the *Jefe de Ordenación Editorial* between 1966 and 1975, not particularly noted for his progressive tendencies (Sánchez Marín's background and career is summarized in Cisquella, pp.35-36).

The presence of a reactionary cleric as head of the body responsible for the censorship of children's literature, even after the supposedly liberalizing *Ley de Prensa* of 1966 is further evidence of the continued vigilance in this area in the latter Francoist period, and of the persistent clerical dominance of governmental bodies relating to the socialization of children.

Vázquez's officious, interventionist approach is illustrated by his penchant for adapting offending references himself, rather than merely eliminating them and leaving the editor to remedy the resulting discontinuity in the text, as was the more usual practice. Cisquella *et al* further exemplify Vázquez's intransigence by alluding to his stubborn refusal to allow the Editorial Novaro to import *Superman* comics from Mexico, presumably because the eponymous superhero might be viewed as usurping the role of God, or at least rivalling Him, as the supreme arbiter of human justice (Cisquella, p.97). Vázquez's objection to the phrase 'la lluvia es omnipotente' in the Editorial Lumen's edition of *El Tío Popoff* certainly suggests that this was the reason (Cisquella, p.98). Consultation with Enrique Tomás de Carranza, the incumbent *Director General de Cultura Popular y Espectáculos*, was ultimately required in order to persuade Vázquez to change his mind about *Superman* (Cisquella, p.97).

This is further evidence of the regime's awareness of the potential power of the comic, a power it had consciously harnessed, much as it did with film, during and immediately after the Civil War, by producing overtly propagandistic products in the genre such as *Flechas* and *Pelayos*.<sup>41</sup> A series of comic strips featuring child protagonists who heroically assisted the Nationalist war effort sprang up (Gasca, p.116). One effect of this appropriation of the genre by the regime was to reverse the trend of the Republican years, during which translated foreign comic strips predominated over domestic creations (Gasca, pp.114-15).

Commercial pressure to import the high-quality American product grew, however, during and after the Second World War. The response of the early regime, like that of the Italian fascists, was to outlaw the new, all-conquering American superheroes and invent domestic equivalents. The conservatism of Francoist children's literature policy is again confirmed by the fact that many of Spain's patriotic superheroes survived well into the 1960s and beyond, whereas their Italian forbears naturally disappeared with Mussolini (Gasca, p.122). Sopeña's favourite example of the genre, *Roberto Alcázar*, for example, endured until 1975.<sup>42</sup> The stories involving these characters showed them outwitting and overpowering a variety of obstacles and enemies, generally in locations too exotic to be politically sensitive (Turkey, Africa, China).

Aside from the obvious point that the longevity of these patriotic warriors further demonstrates the conservatism inherent in Francoist children's literature, it is worth noting that *Roberto Alcázar*, at least, evidently contained a considerable quantity of violence, usually perpetrated by the eponymous hero's club-wielding sidekick, Pedrín. One strip shows the duo beating an uncooperative interlocutor until he falls unconscious, Pedrín remarking at one point 'tiene la cabezota muy dura, pero yo se la ablandaré poco a poco' (Sopeña, p.122). This is one example of the selective application of Item 3(b) of the *Reglamento*, which prohibited 'escenas terroríficas' (see p.93, above) in children's literature. Further examples are discussed in Chapter 7.

It is important to note that the Spanish comic book warriors are not strictly speaking superheroes in the sense that they do not possess supernatural powers. As well as Vázquez's objections to *Superman*, there is further documentary evidence to suggest that the whole issue of supernatural intervention in children's stories was a fraught one for the Francoist ideologists. Specific objections to the agency of supernatural forces in children's stories can be found in the *Catálogo crítico de libros para niños*, which as its name suggests was essentially a children's literature bibliography, annotated according to orthodox principles for the benefit of adults.<sup>43</sup> The *Catálogo* and publications like it are examples of the regime's intervention in a secondary form of censorship which is inherent in literature for children, namely the mediation of parents in the choice of their child's reading.

Item 838 of the 1945 edition of the *Catálogo* warns that the stories in a book of Chinese fairy-tales are 'impregnados de creencias paganas y algunos con ideas de metempsicosis'. In the case of a collection of Japanese fairy-tales, it is noted that 'las ideas desarrolladas son budistas' and that it contains 'unos diablos benéficos' (p.138).

As well as revealing the unease concerning non-Christian supernatural forces, the *Catálogo* faithfully reflects other aspects of orthodox ideology. Xenophobia based on a sense of the moral superiority - and therefore increased sensitivity - of the Spanish race is evident in various entries. A story by Francis Finn is deemed to contain 'algunas expresiones impropias para niños españoles' (p.102). Two other stories by the same author are adjudged to be of dubious value because: 'Las conversaciones y controversias, la exclusiva importancia dada a la fuerza física y otras escenas de ambiente extranjero pueden chocar a los niños españoles que no sepan comprender la diferencia de educación', and 'algunas de las costumbres que describe, corrientes en Norteamérica, son inadmisibles en España' (p.124).

The *Catálogo* seems to confirm the impression that violence is an acceptable ingredient of children's literature as long as it is used in strictly orthodox contexts. Thus works of Christian martyrdom are warmly recommended: 'El Verdugo de su hijo: Martirio de los primeros cristianos de Uganda. Es relato altamente moralizador y ejemplar' (p.137)). Similarly, tales of war and conquest, in what the compilers view as a just cause, are considered highly recommendable for children:

Torquato Tasso, *La Jerusalén Libertada*: Godofredo de Boullón conquista Jerusalén y liberta a los cristianos allí cautivos. Es instructivo y propio para niños por su ambiente de guerras y conquistas. (p.117)

Foreign works containing macabre detail are therefore more likely to be censured, irrespective of their reputation, since they do not generally fulfil the orthodoxy criterion. Thus the Grimm brothers' *Hansel and Gretel* is felt to be 'poco recreativo por su desagradable asunto' (p.49), and Perrault's *Caperucita Roja* contains 'detalles desagradables' and a 'desagradable final' (p.57).

The particular sensitivity to foreignness in children's works on the part of the regime, apparent in these entries in the *Catálogo*, will be examined in succeeding chapters using the direct evidence of censorship documents.

(v) Conclusion

*It is clear that the Franco regime made a serious attempt to manipulate children by installing additional mechanisms of censorship for children's books. Greater xenophobia in the regime's attitude to children's literature was a logical consequence of this extra rigour. There remains some doubt concerning the extent to which the regime's totalitarian intentions in this area were in fact realized, however. Although Nichols's figures suggest that the campaign against translations had a considerably greater effect than in adult literature, she concludes her article with the following assessment:*

*This brief survey of children's literature in the 1940s bears out Carr and Fusi's conclusion that Francoist culture never achieved what it had aspired to, in part for lack of money, in part for lack of a central agency to coordinate cultural policy on all levels. The pious and patriotic ideals for juvenile literature expressed in the early to mid-1940s were only partially realized. Not enough Spanish books were published to limit the influence of foreign authors. The greatest successes in the world of juvenile publishing were commercial - the comic and El Coyote. (Nichols, p.219)*

*Whilst this overall assessment is no doubt accurate, the totalitarian posture of the regime with respect to children's literature had a significant and specific impact on the publishing histories of particular works in Franco's Spain, as the following chapters will demonstrate.*

## NOTES:

1. Ariel Dorfmann and Armand Mattelart, *How to read Donald Duck: Imperialist Ideology in the Disney Comic*, trans. by David Kunzle (New York: International General, 1975), p.36.
2. Antonio Beneyto, *Censura y política en los escritores españoles* (Barcelona: Plaza y Janés, 1977), pp.412-13. Both the 1938 and 1966 *Leyes de Prensa* are reproduced in Beneyto, pp.407-37. The special statute governing children's literature, envisaged in the latter law but enacted some time later, is not included, however.
3. Fernando Cendán Pazos, *Medio siglo de libros infantiles y juveniles en España (1935-1985)* (Madrid: Fundación Sánchez Ruipérez, 1986), p.51.
4. The arbitrariness of Francoist censorship is repeatedly alluded to in the literature on the subject. Manuel Abellán, for example, observes that 'la falta de un *corpus* de criterios objetivados y la ausencia de normas concretas de aplicación inclina a pensar que los ejecutores de la censura se han sentido obligados a acogerse a una divisa innominada que sólo *a posteriori* cabe ir recomponiendo' (Manuel L. Abellán, *Censura y creación literaria en España (1939-1976)* (Barcelona: Editorial Península, 1980), p.87). Several of Beneyto's interlocutors also refer to the arbitrariness of Francoist censorship (Beneyto, pp.83, 149, 271).
5. 'Orden del Ministerio de Interior (29.4.38)', *Boletín Oficial del Estado*, 556(1938), 7035-36.
6. Although the obligation to include the proposed price of the work submitted is not mentioned in Article Three, the application documents which publishers were required to use when submitting a work for censorship habitually demanded this additional information. This tends to confirm that the paper shortage was a mere pretext for requiring all possible information pertaining to a work's intended readership.
7. Helen Graham remarks that 'the Francoist concern with forming the minds of the young - through its manipulation of children's literature and other forms of indoctrination - reflects a view of the populace in general as minors in need of supervision' (Helen Graham, 'Gender and the State: Women in the 1940s' in *Spanish Cultural Studies: An Introduction*, ed. by Helen Graham and Jo Labanyi (Oxford: OUP, 1995), pp.182-95 (p.185)).
8. See also Gubern, p.81. On the creation of the Vicesecretaría de Educación Popular in May 1941, and the consequent ousting of Dionisio Ridruejo from the *Sección de Prensa y Propaganda*, see *Franco*, pp.433-35.
9. In this dissertation, all references to censorship applications will cite the two numbers required in order to locate the relevant documents in the archive: the number of the *expediente*, and the *signatura*, which refers to the number of the box in which the *expediente* is held. The *signatura* is the number required on the petition in the *Archivo de la Administración* in Alcalá de Henares. In the case of works submitted before 1969, the *signatura* should be preceded by the words 'Caja AGA' on the petition. In the case of works submitted in or after 1969, the *Signatura* should be preceded only by the word 'Caja' on the petition. The reference will be given in the form [Author], [Title], [Publisher], [Expediente/Signatura], e.g.: Victor Hugo, *Los miserables*, Tor,

4565-51/9673. The number after the hyphen refers to the year in which the application was made. Where this is not given as part of the *expediente* number, the year is cited in brackets after the full reference.

10. Alfred de Musset, *La confesión de un hijo del siglo*, Sopena, 122-58/11896.
11. Carlos Fortuny, *La Fornarina y su tiempo*, the author, 57-60/12629.
12. Juan Goytisolo alludes to a petition against censorship signed by 210 intellectuals, headed by Ramón Menéndez Pidal in 1960. The regime's response was merely to 'desempolvar viejas tesis, según las cuales, "todo autor moral se autocensura" y "lo que es permitible y hasta bueno para una selección, puede ser dañino y hasta gravemente nocivo para la mayoría"' (Juan Goytisolo, 'Los escritores españoles frente al toro de la censura', in *El furgón de cola* (Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1976), pp.51-61 (pp.53-54))
13. Georgina Cisquella, José Luis Erviti, and José A. Sorolla, *Diez años de represión cultural: La censura de libros durante la Ley de Prensa (1966-1976)* (Barcelona: Anagrama and others, 1977), p.95; Diego Diéguez (pseud.), 'Spain's Golden Silence', *Index on Censorship*, 2.2(1973), 91-99 (p.95).
14. Corín Tellado (pseud. of María del Socorro Tellado López), *Mentira sentimental*, Rollán, 5312-65/16445.
15. José Sánchez Reboredo asserts that 'es un hecho suficientemente conocido que las dificultades crecían en orden progresivo, de acuerdo con la difusión del producto. Eran permitidas obras en ediciones caras en piel (el *Ulises* de Joyce o *El Capital* de Marx) que no podían ser publicadas en ediciones más baratas' (*Palabras Tachadas: Retórica contra censura* (Alicante: Instituto de Estudios Juan Gil Albert, 1988), pp.24-25).  
         Román Gubern refers to 'la tradición censora estatal, según la cual la severidad de la vigilancia y del control debía ser proporcional a la audiencia pública del medio (criterio de discriminación elitista y antidemocrática)' (Gubern, p.263).
16. The account of the evolution of the Spanish publishing trade summarizes Valeriano Bozal, 'La edición en España: Notas para su historia', *Cuadernos para el Diálogo*, 14 Extraordinario (May 1969), 85-93; and Marisa Fernández López, *Traducción y literatura juvenil: Narrativa anglosajona contemporánea en España* (León: Universidad de León, 1996), pp.126-42.
17. Ralph Waldo Emerson, *Normas mentales*, Tor (Saturnino Calleja), 6533-50/9357.
18. One particularly prominent case of such manipulation involved the Editorial Plaza y Janés and Elsa Morante's novel *La Storia*. At a 1976 Rome conference on freedom of expression, the novelist publicly dissociated herself from the mutilated Spanish translation of her novel, complaining also that 'era evidente que los editores tendían a una burda especulación comercial, camuflando mi novela como un bonito *best-seller* innocuo e insospechable' (Cisquella, p.119).
19. Trini de Figueroa, *Paréntesis de inquietud*, Bruguera, 176-52/9762.

20. Antonio Torras Presas, *Una de tantas*, Bruguera, 7355-68/19198. The work was authorized for publication, with a number of suppressions, in April 1969.
21. John Butt, 'Spain's Skin Deep Liberalism', *Index on Censorship*, 3.2 (1974), 51-53.
22. The work was published by the author himself (2358-70/147).
23. William Chislett, *The Spanish Media since Franco* (London: Writers and Scholars Educational Trust, 1979), pp.3-4.
24. Untitled editorial, *Bibliografía Hispánica*, 1.1 (May-June 1942), 1-2 (p.1). *Bibliografía Hispánica* is hereafter cited as *BH*.
25. Miguel Herrero, 'Estadísticas y comentarios', *BH*, 1.5 (December 1942), 1-7.
26. The official campaign against translated literature in the early to mid-1940s is documented in detail in Hurtley, pp.158-63.
27. Julián Pemartín, 'Exposición simbólica del Instituto Nacional del Libro', *BH*, 2.5 (May 1943), 1-11 (p.3).
28. Luis Montañés Fontenla, 'Un nuevo aspecto de la actividad editorial: La publicación de cuadernos infantiles de historietas gráficas', *BH*, 4.6 (June 1945), 343-55.
29. Nichols, p.219; Nichols quotes from the following article: Luis Montañés Fontenla, 'Análisis de un sorprendente éxito editorial', *BH*, 9.2 (February 1950), 23-34.
30. My argument that the regime's high-cultural pretensions were progressively abandoned in favour of mere economic protectionism coincides with, and draws on, Nichols's analysis (see endnote 2, Chapter 1 for full reference).
31. 'Circular número 48 (7 septiembre 1943)', *BH*, 2.8 (September-October 1943), 49; quoted in Hurtley, p.161.
32. 'Circular número 57 (22 noviembre 1943)', *BH*, 2.9 (November-December 1943), 82-84, (p.83); quoted in Bozal, pp.86-87.
33. The following table summarises Bozal's findings (pp.86-87):

Year	Total Literary Works	Translations from English	%
1942	1,242	201	16
1945	1,506	523	35
1946	1,322	404	31
1948	1,399	448	32

34. 'Circular número 52 (30 septiembre 1943)', *BH*, 2.8 (September-October 1943), 49; quoted in Cendán Pazos, p.52.



35. 'Circular número 59 (1 diciembre 1943)', *BH*, 2.9 (November-December 1943, 84; quoted in Cendán Pazos, p.53.
36. Same circular as previous note, this section quoted in Bozal, pp.85-86.
37. 'Decreto 24 junio 1955 (núm.1053)', *BOE*, 204 (23 July 1955), 4509; Aranzadi, *Repertorio cronológico de legislación 1955* (Pamplona: Aranzadi, 1955), pp.843-44. Hereafter, the successive volumes of the *Repertorio* will be cited as 'Aranzadi', followed by the year of the relevant volume.
38. 'Orden 24 junio 1955 (Desarrollo del Decreto de esta fecha)', *BOE*, 33 (2 February 1956), 841; Aranzadi, 1956, pp.249-54.
39. Sheelagh Ellwood, 'The Moving Image of the Franco Regime: Noticiarios y Documentales' in *Spanish Cultural Studies: An Introduction*, ed. by Helen Graham and Jo Labanyi (Oxford: OUP, 1995), pp.201-03; Gubern pp.73-74 (both on the NO-DO); Gubern, pp.66-67 (on Francoist feature films); *Franco*, pp.417-18 (on *Raza*).
40. 'Decreto 19 enero 1967 (núm.195/67)', *BOE*, 37 (13 February 1967), in Aranzadi, 1967, pp.387-90. The implications of the *Estatuto* are also discussed by Cendán Pazos (p.61), who reproduces the entire text in an Appendix, and Cisquella (pp.95-96).
41. Luis Gasca, *Tebeo y cultura de masas* (Madrid: Prensa Española, 1966), p.115.
42. E.Vañó and T.Puerto, *Roberto Alcázar, el intrépido aventurero español* (Valencia: Editorial Valenciana, 1940-1975). Sopeña devotes an entire chapter to this publication (Sopeña, pp.113-29).
43. Gabinete de Lectura Santa Teresa de Jesús, *Catálogo crítico de libros para niños* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Mujeres de Acción Católica, 1945).

## CHAPTER THREE: CENSORSHIP HISTORIES

¿Quién ha proscrito a los proscritos? (Savater, 1976, p.71)

### Introduction

The aim of the present chapter is to chart the censorship histories of *Tom Sawyer* and the *William* books throughout the Franco era. Logically, the principal documentary sources used are censorship reports on the two works (for convenience, the *William* series will hereafter sometimes be referred to as an individual 'work'). The analysis focuses on the censors' overall responses to the works throughout the period, and attempts to relate this to the wider context discussed in Chapters 1 and 2. Although the censors' objections to specific sections of the works may be alluded to here, these objections, and actual suppressions imposed on the works, are discussed in detail in subsequent chapters.

Some initial justification of the texts chosen for study is required in order to contextualize the argument. Firstly, it is clear that *Tom Sawyer* and the *William* books are in many ways very similar. This similarity chiefly resides in two common central features. The first is the personality of the eponymous protagonists, who can be accurately described using the same epithets: mischievous, rebellious, resourceful, enterprising, noble, generally optimistic, occasionally self-indulgent. The second is the fact that both works contain large measures of irony, and both satirize the social milieu in which they are set.

The works also share more peripheral features. As regards characterization, for example, both contain flirtatious girls, each has a 'model' boy who is despised by the hero, and both protagonists are at some stage part of a band of boys whose declared aim is to adopt a criminal lifestyle. In terms of narrative content, certain episodes in each work have strikingly similar counterparts in the other. Notably, both protagonists disrupt a church service by allowing insects or other creatures to escape, and both kiss female characters. Both works also include scenes in which priests, teachers and other figures in authority are ridiculed.

On the other hand, it is also evident that *Tom Sawyer* and the *William* books are different in ways which are likely to have affected the regime's response to each of the two works. *Tom Sawyer*, being an American work published in 1876, is at a greater referential distance from Franco's Spain than the *William* books, whose setting

is European and whose period of publication is more or less contemporaneous with the Franco era. In *Tom Sawyer*, the protagonist's rebelliousness and the author's satire are directed against the self-righteous puritanism of a frontier town, an ethos removed in time and space from National-Catholic Spain. The narrative impetus of the *William* books, on the other hand, is generated by the confrontation between the hero's individuality and the obligation to conform in a setting which is rather less removed from the Spanish child's own frame of reference. This relative proximity would perhaps have generated a closer sense of identification with William than with Tom in the young reader of the Franco era.

Relatedly, the regime may have been sensitive, though perhaps not on a conscious level, to the fact that contemporary Spanish society could be compared unfavorably with the world of the *William* books, in terms of standards of living, particularly before the economic boom of the 1960s.<sup>1</sup> The world of *Tom Sawyer*, on the other hand, could not be construed as a spur to envious sentiments, since it was a world which no longer existed, and in which material comforts were anyway scarce.

There are further essential differences between the worlds portrayed in the two works. In the nineteenth-century frontier setting of *Tom Sawyer*, society struggles to suppress the constant threat of lawlessness arising from the geographically marginal location. The novel thus contains some characters who are genuinely pathetic or disquieting, notably the homeless Huckleberry Finn, whose father is an alcoholic, and Injun Joe, so embittered with his lot that he is capable of murder. This murder, described in macabre detail, is the incident which drives the novel's plot. It is a decidedly adult theme, therefore, which is at the centre of *Tom Sawyer's* identity as a novel, for without Tom's involvement in Injun Joe's fate, the boy's story would consist of a series of childish adventures connected only by a common set of characters (which is precisely what the *William* books are).

The world of the *William* books, on the other hand, is much more protected, and the interpenetration between the child and adult dimensions is much less fraught with danger. Although William and his Outlaws occasionally get into fights with other boys, or are physically punished by adults for misdemeanours, they very rarely cross paths with actual criminals, and they never confront genuine violence or evil. In the *William* books, therefore, the innocence of the child is never threatened.

Given the areas of psychological shade and hard realism in *Tom Sawyer*, it seems fair to regard it as intrinsically less apt for an exclusively juvenile readership than the *William* books. This difference in literary identity also relates to the disparity in cultural prestige between the two works. One of the reasons why the cultural prestige of *Tom Sawyer* in Franco's Spain was undoubtedly greater than that of the *William* books is the former work's equivocal status as a children's book. Two other reasons are relevant, however: firstly, *Tom Sawyer* is a novel, with all the aesthetic privilege this bestows, whilst the *William* books are more explicitly episodic and comprise many volumes; secondly, the first publication of Twain's masterpiece predated the Franco era by over sixty years, during which time it achieved classic status, whilst the *William* books, although they later became well-known, initially lacked the prestige conferred by historical perspective.

Both these latter reasons have a bearing on the perception of the works as suitable for children. With regard to the first point, the fact that *Tom Sawyer* is unmistakably a novel makes its classification as children's literature problematic: although Twain designated his creation as a work principally intended for children in his prologue, the sophistication and sheer extent of the novel form would tend to recommend it as a work for older children, at least, if not for adults. The episodic form and serialized publication of the *William* books, on the other hand, approximate them to the comic, generally, if not exclusively, perceived as a children's genre.

Turning to the second point, it is clear that many children's works rely on engaging the young reader by soliciting immediate recognition and identification. Since the young child, lacking knowledge and experience, is less capable of making allowances for the shift in mores and assumptions that the passage of time inevitably brings, children's works often quickly lose their capacity to engage the child in this immediate fashion. In many cases, therefore, the most appropriate readership age-group of a work originally intended for children rises as time passes, and greater knowledge and sophistication are required to accommodate the increasingly archaic frame of reference.

If the work lacks the necessary qualities or prestige, it will simply lapse into obsolescence. If its appeal proves to be enduring, it will tend to migrate away from the category of 'children's literature', understood as literature merely for children,

towards the far more culturally prestigious territory of the 'children's classic'. The target-readership of this latter category is open to question. It is understood that children's classics were originally written for children, but the 'classic' label frequently designates a work whose perennial aesthetic value makes it rewarding for an adult readership. Paul Heim describes the evolution of works written originally for children as follows:

There are 'live' books and 'dead' books, books which no longer concern their primary audience (and yet concern no one else except historians). Paradoxically, although many books 'sink' towards childhood, so many rise towards adulthood. The children's book is, by definition, then, something immediate; and the immediate is prone to be ephemeral, and to interact with the immediate culture. Not many books from such a background subsequently rise to become 'high culture'.<sup>2</sup>

*Tom Sawyer* of course belongs to the category of children's works which have risen to become 'high culture'. As Peter Hunt suggests in relation to Heim's remarks, however, although a rise in prestige may save a children's work from the rapid oblivion which consumes most examples of the genre, such a rise also constitutes, inevitably, a movement away from the category of children's literature: 'Most of us, I think, would be inclined to regard as legitimate children's books only those which are essentially contemporary; there is a limit to which children's books can be said to survive as "live" books.' (Hunt, p.61).

Later, Hunt develops this argument, establishing a distinction which is relevant to the problematic classification of *Tom Sawyer* :

It could be argued that we should divide the study of children's literature between those books which were once for children (or purported to be) in a childhood culture that is no longer accessible or relevant to us, and those that are still bought and read as children's books. There will, of course, be a grey area; but it would mean that children's literature as we know it today dates from the 1920s, with only occasional examples before that. (Hunt, p.200)

Although Hunt's cut-off point is arguable, the distinction he makes is particularly relevant to *perceptions* of *Tom Sawyer* and the *William* books, works which lie on either side of Hunt's dividing line. As will become apparent below, the fact that the *William* books were unequivocally considered as belonging to the category of children's books (whether they were suitable for *Spanish* children is clearly another matter), whereas *Tom Sawyer* occupied Hunt's grey area, had a significant influence on the works' respective censorship histories.

In conclusion, it is the intriguing blend of striking similarity and significant difference between *Tom Sawyer* and the *William* books which makes them especially apt for a study of this kind. Their similarity means that the reception of each can be used as a control in the light of which the fate of the other can be interpreted. Given this underlying similarity between the two works, if there is any divergence in the regime's responses to each, it must have been caused by some factor lying in the crucial area of disparity. Such divergence will thus reveal the importance as censorship criteria of the factors which distinguish the two works, namely their respective socio-cultural frames of reference, literary identities and levels of cultural prestige.

## Part I: The Earlier Period

### (i) *William* 1938-1956

In 1935, José María Huertas Ventosa, director of the Editorial Molino, launched *Mickey*, a children's comic which drew most of its storylines and characters from North American originals. The comic quickly attracted a readership eager for the best in foreign comic-book material, which was presented in *Mickey* with an attention to detail unusual for the period. Political turmoil interfered with the Editorial Molino's activities, however, and the publication lasted less than a year. Despite its brief lifespan, however, *Mickey* is of no small historical importance in the annals of twentieth-century Spanish publishing, for it launched one of the most popular children's characters of the era:

En el número diez se inicia la publicación por capítulos de varias obras de Richmal Crompton sobre Guillermo (William), uno de los personajes de la mitología popular infantil que más hondo va a calar en la mentalidad de los niños españoles. (Gasca, 1969, p.77)

After the demise of *Mickey*, Molino began to import full-length translations of the *William* books from its base in Buenos Aires.<sup>3</sup> Importation of the first three titles Molino submitted for censorship during the Franco era, *Guillermo el incomprendido*, *Guillermo el genial* and *Guillermo el conquistador* (Appendix A, nos.1, 2, 3), followed a common pattern: one thousand copies of each title were imported, followed by a further thousand one year later. *Guillermo el incomprendido* (no.2) was met with indifference by the denizens of the new culture, as the censor's report shows:

Valor literario o artístico: Corriente  
Valor documental: Ninguno  
Matiz político: Ninguno  
Tachaduras: Ninguna  
Otras observaciones: Ninguna

The first report on *Guillermo el genial* (no.1) is only a little less laconic:

Valor literario: Suficiente  
Valor documental: El adecuado a este tipo de obra  
Otras Observaciones: Novela de aventuras apropiadas a jóvenes, con rasgos de ingenio. Moral. Puede publicarse.

When Molino reapplied to import *Guillermo el incomprendido* in 1941, however, the work elicited a more appreciative response from a censor clearly better attuned to Crompton's irony:

Valor literario o artístico: Positivo

Matiz político: Ninguno

Otras observaciones: Libro de un humorismo [pedagógico] desconcertante, complicado, extraño, pero entretenido. Literariamente es muy original. Puede autorizarse su publicación.

This report is unusual because the epithets employed to describe the work contrast with those used to approve a children's publication in later years of the regime, when positive judgements normally signalled that a work was merely 'ameno', 'inofensivo' or 'moral'. This is evidence of the intellectual, literary critical style of censorship report which it was predicted might be prevalent in this era (see p.57, above).

The ironical nature of Crompton's humour, alluded to by the censor here, in fact militated against the series only a few years later, precisely because it was alien ('extraño') and unsettling ('desconcertante'). The fact that this humour was undeniably amusing ('entretenido') simply made the works more suspicious in later orthodox eyes, a question discussed further below (p.117).

The third title to be imported, *Guillermo el conquistador* (no.3), elicited an equally laudatory response, but this time couched in more conventional terms:

Valor literario y artístico: Apreciable

Otras observaciones: Aventuras muy amenas y bien compuestas, para niños. Traducidos del original inglés. Puede autorizarse.

In the same year, Molino's reprint of *Guillermo el genial* attracted even higher praise, being somewhat improbably described as 'un libro de cuentos morales' by a censor who also found it 'muy gracioso'.

The next title, *Guillermo hace de las suyas* (no.4), continued the trend of positive responses, initially receiving a standard evaluation: 'Nueva serie de aventuras de Guillermo tan amenas y graciosas como las anteriores.' Just one year later, however, the same work was tersely dismissed: 'Estimo este libro nada educativo. Propongo no se autorice.' The fact that the same work received contradictory judgements within a year is clearly of interest, since it suggests a change of censorship criteria provoked by some external circumstance. This was not the first work of the series to attract the opprobrium of the authorities, however: in February 1942, Molino were prevented from circulating *Los apuros de Guillermo* (no.5), and in early



November of the same year, their petition to publish *Guillermo el proscrito* ( no.7) met a similar fate.

One circumstance which may have militated against the series is Molino's decision, from *Los apuros de Guillermo* onwards, to attempt to publish the books in Spain, rather than importing them from its base in Argentina. The first four titles were imported in consignments of only one thousand copies each. Perhaps because of the success of these in Spain, Molino transferred production to Barcelona. With no tariffs or postage costs to pay, Molino could afford to propose an increased number of copies in its petitions to the censor: the suggested print-run for *Los apuros de Guillermo* (no.5) and *Travesuras de Guillermo* (no.6) is eight thousand copies each; for *Guillermo el proscrito* (no.7) and *Guillermo hace de las suyas* (no.4), this increases to ten thousand copies each.

Why should the move from small-scale importation to large-scale publication *in situ* represent a disadvantage in the eyes of the censors? The censors' reports on the first title to be prohibited, *Los apuros de Guillermo*, supply some clues as to why this might be:

**Andrés:** Libro de lecturas para niños traducidos del inglés y con absoluta mentalidad inglesa - no deja de tener 'humour', pero creo que es preferible que los niños españoles lean lecturas españolas.

**Conde:** Por su carácter de cuento infantil traducido del inglés, aunque no se halla nada censurable en el mismo, opinamos debe darse preferencia en esta clase de publicaciones a las netamente españolas y suspender aquellas mientras duren las circunstancias de escasez de papel.

**Peña:** Un libro de lecturas para niños que no posee nada malo ni nada bueno. Propongo su no aprobación.

The first point of interest is that the reports of three different censors are included in the documents relating to this work. The censorship apparatus theoretically provided that all works should be evaluated by three readers, but in practice many works, at least in the area of children's literature, seem to have been assessed by a single censor. The inclusion of three reports may be merely an exceptional case of the system functioning in the prescribed manner. Given its rarity, however, observance of the full procedure may also suggest that a closer scrutiny was deliberately undertaken in the case of this work. This may have been a consequence of Molino's proposal to raise the number of copies in its application: a more attentive reappraisal may have been thought necessary because the publishers, known to be astute judges, felt the

series was potentially very popular. 'Popular' for Molino would mean simply lucrative; for the censor it would mean ideologically influential and possibly pernicious.

It is clear from the reports, however, that it was not merely the potentially large readership which motivated the suppression of the *William* books from early 1942 onwards. The reports for *Los apuros de Guillermo* (no.5) reveal the appearance of a new criterion: the first two censors' objections to the work are specifically motivated by its Englishness. There is an important difference of emphasis between the two reports, however: Andrés's objection is on purely ideological grounds, because the consciousness which informs the work is alien and therefore suspicious ('con absoluta mentalidad inglesa'). He grudgingly concedes that the work is entertaining ('no deja de tener "humour"'), but his final recommendation is that the work be suppressed purely on the grounds of its foreignness ('pero creo que es preferible que los niños españoles lean lecturas españolas').

Andrés's use of the English word 'humour' betrays his discomfort with what he perceives to be the particularly English brand of irony employed by Crompton in the *William* books. This is the 'humorismo desconcertante, complicado, extraño, pero entretenido' which the censor of *Guillermo el incomprendido* (no.2) approvingly alluded to, but by this time, clearly, the climate had turned against the *William* books to such an extent that such nonconformity had become unacceptable.

For Conde, on the other hand, the content of the work is wholly innocuous ('no se halla nada censurable en el mismo'). It is merely the work's provenance which argues against its publication ('opinamos debe darse preferencia en esta clase de publicaciones a las netamente españolas') in the light of purely pragmatic external considerations ('mientras duren las circunstancias de escasez de papel'). Here the implications for foreign children's literature of Article Two of the *Orden Ministerial* of 1938 are evident (see p.54, above). The hierarchy of texts established because of the paper shortage is shown to be a mechanism for discriminating against foreign works. The particular application of this mechanism to children's literature can be inferred from Conde's allusion to 'esta clase de publicaciones'.

It is clear from Conde's use of the corporate first person plural, in contrast to the other two censors, that his judgement carries the stamp of superior approval, and is thus closest to an expression of official policy. Andrés's report alludes more

obliquely to the adoption of protectionist measures in the field of children's literature, though he stresses the ideological advantages of such a posture, rather than the related pragmatic concern, the shortage of paper.

Both reports coincide in reflecting a rather different notion of censorship from that which underlay most Francoist censorship practice. Both Conde and Andrés assess the work in its totality, and reject it on the basis of its overall character. This contrasts with the more superficial procedure of scanning the work for overtly objectionable references which was generally employed by the Francoist censors. This new 'global' approach to censorship seems to reflect the regime's relatively totalitarian aspirations regarding the strict control of culture in the early period.

Turning to the third censor of *Los apuros de Guillermo*, Peña's report is a small masterpiece of self-protective caution. He seems aware that the direction of the wind has changed against the series, and that a negative judgement is therefore required of him, but he is clearly uncertain as to the grounds on which he is expected to condemn the work. We can surmise from Peña's caution that not all censors were officially informed of the new protectionist orthodoxy regarding children's literature. It is clear that the provincial censorship authorities, for example, were unaware of the change in posture. This is evident from the fact that the file for this work contains an additional censorship document signed by the *Jefe Provincial de Propaganda*, whose judgement reads simply 'propuesto para su autorización'. Why the opinion of the *Jefe Provincial* should have been sought at all is unclear - only books under thirty-two pages were normally assessed by the provincial censorship apparatus (see p.84, above) - but it perhaps confirms that the *William* series was being subjected to a general scrutiny to determine its suitability.

The impression that only some members of the censorship apparatus were aware of the new protectionist posture is confirmed by the reports on *Travesuras de Guillermo* (no.6), the next title Molino submitted for censorship. The first censor, the poet Leopoldo Panero, had clearly heard nothing of the new posture, and therefore judged according to the old criteria, which dictated that objections should be based on explicit transgressions in specific categories: 'Es una serie de narraciones para niños, escritas con ingenuidad y sencillez. No creemos haya en ella nada reprochable.'

As with *Los apuros de Guillermo*, the provincial censor also stated that the work was fit for publication. Conde's judgement, which reiterates the policy alluded to with respect to *Los apuros de Guillermo*, was apparently decisive in banning the work, however:

Se trata de un cuento infantil que, aunque por su tema no se halla nada censurable, tiene el inconveniente de ser una traducción del inglés, y por lo tanto el carácter y las costumbres extraños al niño español. Dada la escasez de papel opinamos debe darse la preferencia, en esta clase de publicaciones, a los libros infantiles españoles.

Once again, the fusion of pragmatic and ideological considerations is evident in Conde's allusions to both the paper shortage, on the one hand, and the alien character and customs of the work. However, the Ministry's conviction in the new policy, or at least its application to the *William* books, is called into question by the document in which the final judgement on *Travesuras de Guillermo* is given. Amidst various illegible annotations, the word 'autorizada' clearly appears. It has been scored out, however, and the word 'suspendida' written above it. This cannot be the result of an initial positive decision by Panero being overruled by a negative one on the part of Conde, as one might surmise to be the case, since the words 'autorizado' and 'suspendido' are written in the same hand. A further anomaly in the documentation relating to *Travesuras de Guillermo* is the illogical sequence of dates: Conde's negative report is clearly dated 19 March, yet the final negative resolution bears the date 11 March. How this came about remains mysterious, but it adds to the impression of indecision regarding this work on the part of the censorship apparatus.<sup>4</sup>

The censors' vacillations with regard to *Travesuras de Guillermo* may have been caused by the fact that an edition of the work dating from before the Civil War was already circulating in Spain. The work had first been published in 1935, and appears in the *Catálogo crítico de libros para niños* (1945), demonstrating that it was still accessible in bookshops in the mid-1940s. If they were aware of this pre-war edition, the censors may initially have felt that the prohibition of a work already freely circulating was futile.

The entry in the *Catálogo* for *Los apuros de Guillermo*, the title rejected by the censors just five days before *Travesuras de Guillermo* provides additional evidence of an ambivalent orthodox attitude towards the series:

La figura principal del relato es el niño inglés, Guillermo. Refiere las peripecias que en unión de sus íntimos lleva a cabo, sembrando el desorden en todo cuanto interviene. No puede decirse que sea perjudicial, pero no beneficia su lectura. (p.128)

The final sentence of this assessment grudgingly accords the work a neutral status according to the orthodox notion of children's literature. As in the official censors' reports, underlying the author's use of the words '*no puede decirse* que sea perjudicial' there is the implication that in an ideal, more totalitarian world, one could condemn such a work outright, but given the merely authoritarian posture allowed by the exigencies of the book market, only overtly transgressive works can be unreservedly denounced.

In order to appreciate the full implications of the *Catálogo's* judgement on *Travesuras de Guillermo*, a brief digression is required, for the judgement constitutes something of an enigma in *William's* censorship history. It reads as follows:

Divertidas travesuras de Guiller mó, que, sugestionado por las lecturas y el cine, pretende realizar disparatadas empresas, en las que fracasa ruidosamente. Desentona del conjunto la exhibición, aunque rápida, de una niña coquetuela. Estilo ingenioso.

It is notable that this assessment of the work employs the terms '*travesuras*' and '*disparatadas empresas*' in a positive sense. The use of such words in an approbatory context is a feature of official censorship reports on the *William* books from the later Francoist period, but is unusual in the earlier period (see p.135, below).

The sensation that the wording of this entry in the *Catálogo* is strangely similar to that of later censorship reports is confirmed by the evidence of the official documentation relating to *Guillermo buscador de tesoros* (no.28), submitted for censorship in 1964. The first sentence of the first censor's report on this work is almost identical to the first sentence of the *Catálogo* entry on *Travesuras de Guillermo*. This surely cannot be a coincidence. So long after the event, the question of how this bizarre transposition came about can only be a matter for speculation. One possibility is that the censor of *Guillermo buscador de tesoros* simply plagiarized what he felt to be a suitably general description of any *William* book, because he did not have time to compile a proper report. However it happened, it strongly suggests very close links between the compilers of the catalogue and the official, internal censors.

Returning to the evidence for a lack of clarity regarding the implementation of the new protectionist criteria, new heights of ambivalence were reached in late 1942, when Molino resubmitted *Los apuros de Guillermo* (no.5), and applied to publish *Guillermo el proscrito* (no.7) for the first time. Despite being prohibited in a smaller print-run a mere eight months earlier, *Los apuros de Guillermo* was authorized, by a censor whose signature is illegible, with the simple remark 'puede pasar'. There is no evidence that a second censor ratified this decision, however. This tends to suggest that the work was given to a junior figure who was not aware of the new protectionist orthodoxy, and that as in the case of Panero and *Travesuras de Guillermo* (no.6), this censor was operating according to the old criteria. Why his decision was not overruled by a more senior figure, as in the case of other applications in this era, remains a mystery.

Neither was the censor of the October application aware of the earlier prohibition of the work, for he makes no mention of a previous application. This must mean that Molino did not explicitly state the fact that they were applying for the work to be revised, rather than assessed for the first time, in the submission documents they sent to the censor (no such statement is present in the documents still held in the Archive). As will become apparent below, Molino were infringing the statutory procedure by failing to recognize that permission to publish the work had already been refused by the censor. Given the short time elapsed between the first and second submissions, it seems likely that the omission of this information was a deliberate ploy by Molino, rather than an oversight caused by vagueness about whether the work had been submitted before or not. The purpose of such a stratagem would be to avoid the work being automatically rejected on the grounds that a previous rejection had already been recorded in the Ministry's censorship files (this mechanism is discussed further below in relation to *Tom Sawyer*). Whether it was deliberate or not, the ploy worked on this occasion, since the censor, or whoever was responsible for doing so, clearly failed to check if the work had passed through the censorship apparatus before.

The file relating to *Guillermo el proscrito* (no.7) demonstrates that the lack of consistency in the application of the new protectionist policy cannot be attributed only to the fact that some censors were aware of it whilst others were not, however. The

file contains two judgements of the work, both signed by Conde. These judgements bear the dates of consecutive days, but are utterly contradictory:

**2 de noviembre:** Cuento inglés de carácter infantil. No encontramos nada que impida su publicación.

**3 de noviembre:** Cuento infantil de marcado carácter inglés que desentona con la formación de nuestra infancia, por lo que estimamos no debe ser autorizado.

At this distance in time one can only speculate as to why Conde, who had previously been the chief mouthpiece of the new protectionist orthodoxy, should suddenly forget the new repression against translated works and revert to the old criteria.

In contrast to his earlier judgements, Conde makes no allusion to the paper shortage in the decisive negative report of 3 November. The pragmatic component of the policy of greater stringency with respect to translated literature now appears to have been forgotten or suppressed. The accompanying ideological rationale, according to which the mere alien character of a foreign children's work could disqualify it, rather than transgression in specific taboo categories, had apparently become the new orthodoxy. Conde's contradictory initial report, however, suggests that this new rigour, however it was justified, was conceived as a temporary or selective measure.

The reports on *Guillermo el organizador* (no.8), submitted for censorship in August 1943 reveal that the new intransigence persisted, however, at least in the case of the *William* books. Perhaps in an attempt to mollify the authorities, Molino reverted to its former practice of applying to import one thousand copies of the work from its Buenos Aires base. The new xenophobia had become so firmly entrenched, however, that even the publisher's willingness to circulate a vastly reduced number of copies, and without using its national paper quota, was by this stage not enough to save the series:

¿Ataca al dogma o a la moral?: Para niños, corriente.

¿A las instituciones del régimen?: No.

¿Tiene valor literario o documental?: Flojo.

Razones circunstanciales que

aconsejan una u otra decisión: Aventuras de niños traviesos con espíritu quizás impertinente para España, por exceso de 'americanismo sajón' y porque el obispo, sacerdotes son 'pastores' protestantes. Se propone la suspensión.

It is important to note at this stage, however, that although all attempts to publish new titles in the *William* series were fruitless in this period, there is no

evidence that the regime made any direct attempt to prohibit the titles already in circulation. Even in the area of children's literature, it seems that the Francoist censorship apparatus was generally not so zealous as to contemplate retroactive suppression of works whose publication it had previously permitted.<sup>5</sup> The practical difficulties of enforcing the general withdrawal of published works, at least on a regular basis, clearly exceeded the regime's capabilities. In any case, such decisive and visible action was unlikely to be suggested given the generally somewhat secretive character of the censorship mechanism, and the fact that such seizures constituted an admission that the prior censorship procedure had failed to perform its function.

Nevertheless, expressions of orthodox disapproval of the *William* series in this period were not entirely limited to the internal realm of the censorship apparatus. In an article in *Solidaridad Nacional*, dated 12 May 1943, José de Quintana specifically singled out the series as an example of the lamentable lack of patriotic discernment on the part of Spanish publishers.<sup>6</sup> In a fashion typical of the era, Quintana begins by pointing up the particular perils of the book compared to other media:

En el teatro y en el cine, nos ocupamos de marcar qué obras son 'aptas' para ser contempladas por la juventud y, en cambio, el libro, más efectivo porque puede ser leído y estudiado, está al alcance de todas las manos.

Quintana then offers concrete examples of typically unsuitable texts, bluntly identifying the reason why their authors are unwelcome in Franco's Spain:

Habría que buscar la forma de poder evitar que pueda llegar a ser leído por un joven o una joven, un libro de Stefan Zweig, o por un niño, una de esas *Aventuras de Guillermo*, que tanto se venden.

Pongo, por ejemplo, estos dos casos, sin que sean, ni mucho menos, únicos, pero sí característicos. Judíos o anglosajones tenían que ser.

Quintana then enumerates the particular features of the *William* books which make them inappropriate for Spanish children:

Menos importancia, pero si alguna, tienen los libros infantiles que se dedican a glosar las travesuras, canalladitas, hurtos, mentiras, faltas de educación, despego y hasta a veces odio hacia padres y hermanos de un *precioso y simpatiquísimo* héroe juvenil de diez o doce años, como el Guillermito de mister (sic) Richmal Crompton.

(Emphasis as in original)

Quintana then goes on to suggest that even Spanish adults, and more especially writers, should be prevented from reading the *William* books, insinuating that the alleged excesses contained in Elena Fortún's *Celia* books may be attributable to the



influence of Crompton's works on the Spanish author. Like the censorship documents, Quintana's article demonstrates the humourless piety and austere literalism which dominated official circles in this era, and which determined that the mischievous spirit of the *William* books would be roundly rejected.

Nevertheless, in late 1944, Molino again applied to publish *Guillermo el proscrito* (no.7), which had received Conde's contradictory evaluations two years earlier. In their application, however, the publishers once again failed to mention that the work had been previously rejected. This provoked the wrath of the *Delegado Nacional de Propaganda*, who responded to Molino's application with the following letter:

Vista su instancia de fecha 26 del corriente, en solicitud de la autorización reglamentaria de edición de la obra de Richmal Crompton *Guillermo el proscrito*;

Visto que con fecha de 5 de noviembre de 1942 fue decidida la suspensión de publicación de dicha obra y en la nueva instancia referida, no se hace referencia a este antecedente en contra del trámite establecido;

Esta Delegación Nacional ha resuelto suspender el despacho de las solicitudes que tenga presentada esa Editorial Molino durante el plazo de un mes, de la fecha de esta comunicación.

Lo que pongo en su conocimiento a los debidos efectos. Por Dios, España y su Revolución Nacional-Sindicalista. Madrid, 31 de octubre de 1944.

The Editorial Molino appealed against this decision, claiming that the failure to mention the previous rejection of the work was a mere oversight:

La omisión de tan importante dato en la citada solicitud de edición presentada por Editorial Molino fue completamente involuntaria y debida a un descuido del Jefe de la sección de correspondencia que habiendo recibido orden de la Dirección de que solicitara revisión de expediente de censura de la obra *Guillermo el proscrito* y de publicación de tres obras más, entregó a la mecanógrafa todas las obras sin hacer la advertencia de que una de ellas era para revisión de expediente, tal y como siempre lo ha venido haciendo Editorial Molino y puede comprobarse por los antecedentes que obrarán en este Departamento.

Given that Molino had seemingly employed this subterfuge successfully before, it seems likely that the omission of the relevant information was in fact deliberate. If this is the case, however, the publishers' invitation to the censors to check their previous observance of the procedure was an audacious one, since a careful scrutiny of the files on *Los apuros de Guillermo* (no.5) would presumably demonstrate that Molino had in fact succeeded in duping the censor on a previous occasion. Whatever

the veracity of Molino's protestations, the *Delegación Nacional's* reply, also included in the file on this application, shows that they were in vain:

Esta Delegación Nacional, previa propuesta aprobada del servicio correspondiente, ha resuelto mantener la sanción referida habida cuenta que la misma, no existiendo atenuación suficiente en la falta cometida, ha sido la mínima aplicable, advirtiéndoles de la gravedad de la sanción a que nueva infracción por su parte daría lugar.

With the title *Guillermo el proscrito* now seeming more apt than ever, and with the entire series apparently irredeemable in the prevailing ideological climate, Molino resolved to avoid further confrontation with the censor, suspend further applications and await more favorable conditions.

The publishers tested the waters again in October 1949, attempting to publish eight thousand copies of *Guillermo el organizador* (no.8), which had been rejected in 1943. No new assessment was made, however, and permission to publish the work was denied again. In his brief report, the censor simply cited the earlier negative report on the work as justification for rejecting it a second time.

No further attempt was made to publish Crompton's work until late 1958, a gap of nine years. The censorship history of the *William* books during the later Francoist period is described below (pp.134-44).

#### (ii) *Tom Sawyer* 1938-1956

According to the documentation held in the Archive, the censorship history of *Tom Sawyer* under Franco began in late 1941, precisely the moment when the *William* books started to suffer discrimination because of their foreign character. Although *Tom Sawyer's* foreign provenance is mentioned in the report on Espasa Calpe's edition (Appendix B, no.1), it is the censor's praise for the book's literary quality which is the dominant feature:

Valor literario: Excelente

Valor documental: Paisajista

Matiz político: Nulo

Otras observaciones: Narración lograda de las aventuras de un niño, pero con destino a personas ambientadas en países nórdicos. Interesante. Creemos se puede permitir su difusión.

As well as the censor's appreciation of the novel's literary merit, his characterization of it as 'paisajista' and 'interesante' are worthy of note, since they

implicitly suggest that the work's foreign setting might actually have been viewed as a positive, educational feature. Ultimately, however, his description of the work as 'con destino a personas ambientadas en países nórdicos' sounds a note of warning, suggesting that the policy of additional xenophobia soon to be implemented in the case of the *William* books might have been about to create similar difficulties for prospective publishers of *Tom Sawyer*.

The publishers of the next edition submitted for censorship avoided any new stringency, however, by heavily adapting the work. Ediciones Marco's version (no.2), which uses comic-style graphics, inevitably truncates and simplifies the work almost beyond recognition. Many events in the original narrative are simply omitted, and without the mediation of a narrator, all irony is lost from those episodes which are recounted. Satire is also eliminated, since the allusions to the social milieu in which the narrative unfolds are transposed into bland pictures.

Radical adaptations of this type became a more common feature of the publishing history of *Tom Sawyer* in the later period, when the work began to experience censorship difficulties.<sup>7</sup> Commissioning and publishing such adaptations must have seemed an attractive commercial proposition to publishers, since they combined the growing popularity of the comic format with the literary prestige of the original work, whilst at the same time providing an opportunity to excise problematic features. Adapting the work was certainly no guarantee of a favorable censorship judgement, however, and in the case of *Tom Sawyer*, it sometimes even made the censors' response even more hostile than it might otherwise have been (see pp.150, 165, below).

Nevertheless, in this early period during which *Tom Sawyer* was generally viewed favourably, Marco's adapted version was published without difficulties. The censor made no comment about the quality or content of the adaptation. It is worth remarking, however, that this version portrays, in both words and pictures, the scene in which Injun Joe murders Doctor Robinson in the cemetery, an episode repeatedly objected to in the later Francoist period, particularly when it was included in adaptations.

The report on the next full-length edition of *Tom Sawyer* submitted for censorship, by Ediciones Nausica (no.3), confirms that the foreign character of

children's works was becoming an increasingly significant criterion in censorship circles. After describing the work as 'de estilo literario ágil', the censor made the following observations:

Obra de ambiente muy norteamericano y en la cual se ensalza, en cierto modo, la piratería. Se narran unas aventuras ocurridas a unos muchachos. Al lado de episodios ingenuos se plantean otros, a los que corresponden las tachaduras, que estimamos impropios, teniendo en cuenta que la obra está escrita para que la lean los muchachos. El ideal de los protagonistas es llegar a ser ladrones, objeto que consiguen, aunque un poco en juego, al final de la novela.

The censor went on to indicate nine pages on which s/he had marked text for suppression. This edition of *Tom Sawyer* is one of the few, from the earlier period, for which the proofs of the translation are included with the censorship application, allowing us to identify these suppressions precisely. The suppressions imposed on this edition are discussed in greater detail in Chapters 4 to 7, but it is worth remarking here that by far the longest passage marked for excision by the censor is the scene in which Doctor Robinson is murdered by Injun Joe. The fact that this scene was included in Marco's children's adaptation, and yet it attracted no comment from the censor of that edition, suggests the extent to which the caprices of individual censors could affect the outcome of an application to publish a work.

Returning to Nausica's application, the censor's initial definition of the work as 'de ambiente muy norteamericano' forms the basis of his criticism, which specifically focuses on the exaltation of piracy and theft. Both of the censor's objections to unexemplary criminal behaviour are qualified, it should be noted, by a certain recognition that such behaviour is presented as mere fantasy or play. Thus 'se ensalza *en cierto modo* la piratería' and 'el ideal de los protagonistas es llegar a ser ladrones, objeto que consiguen *aunque un poco en juego*' (my emphasis). As will become apparent in Chapter 7, the acceptable limits of childish play in literature were a constant preoccupation of the censors (see pp.281-90, below).

It is important to point out one further feature of the report on the Nausica edition which distinguishes it from other reports on *Tom Sawyer* in the early period, namely that it makes explicit reference to the fact that this edition is intended for children. This is the only case in the period before 1957 in which a full-length edition of the work is openly referred to as a children's book. It therefore serves as an

example of the regime's response, in the early period, to the full text of *Tom Sawyer* when it was perceived to be specially intended for children.

Quite why *Tom Sawyer* was considered to be a children's work in this edition, but not in others in the earlier period, remains something of a mystery. The translation used by Nausica, by Simón Santainés, was later used by Ediciones Lauro and by the Editorial Mateu, in editions which were not viewed as specifically intended for children.<sup>8</sup> The Nausica edition was not published in a collection obviously intended only for children (Turgenev was amongst the authors of other works in the collection), and the presentation of the edition is not more child-like than other editions not explicitly placed in the category of children's literature by the censors (it has a relatively childish cover illustration, but no intercalated graphics of any kind).

As we shall see in the analysis of *Tom Sawyer's* later censorship history (pp.144-68, below), the legal inscription of children's literature as a special category requiring particular vigilance meant that either the publishers or the censors, or both, were habitually forced to decide whether Twain's masterpiece was a children's work or not, or at least whether a particular edition was intended for children or not. In the great majority of cases in the later period, it was indeed viewed as a children's work. As children's literature steadily became the last arena in which the regime felt that its battle for the purification of culture could justifiably be fought, so all its remaining zeal was channelled into that arena. Thus because children's literature had become an area of special rigour, the number of specific objections to episodes in *Tom Sawyer* in the later Francoist period actually increased from the level registered in the report on the Nausica edition (see p.155, below).

This point is reinforced by another fact which is not easy to account for: unlike the suppressions imposed on editions of *Tom Sawyer* in the later period, those imposed on the Nausica edition were not in fact carried out, or at least they have not been effected in the copy held in the Biblioteca Nacional. It is not clear why Ediciones Nausica were able completely to ignore the censor's stipulations, but a possible explanation is that the publishers managed to persuade the authorities, in informal subsequent negotiations, that their edition was not specifically intended for children.

Given the evidence of reports on the first two full-length editions of *Tom Sawyer*, and that of the *William* books, it would seem reasonable to assume that *Tom*

*Sawyer* might have begun to encounter difficulties around this time. This turns out not to be the case at all, however: between 1943 and mid-1957, sixteen editions of *Tom Sawyer* were submitted for censorship (nos.4-19); all were authorized and no suppressions were imposed. This leniency towards *Tom Sawyer*, in contrast to the intransigence towards the *William* books, might be attributable to one or several of the factors already discussed which could militate in favour or against a work submitted for censorship: higher price and lower print-run, adaptation, cultural prestige or literary classification.

Higher price does not seem to have been a significant factor: for the eleven editions whose proposed sale price appears on the censorship document or on the published work, the average price is just over twenty pesetas; no edition exceeds seventy-five pesetas, and four are under ten pesetas (Mateu's *Cinco mejores obras de Mark Twain* is excluded from this calculation). These prices compare fairly favourably with the early *William* volumes, which cost six pesetas in the 1940s, and twenty in the late 1950s and early 1960s (see p.312, below). No censor mentions the price of any edition of *Tom Sawyer* as either a mitigating or an aggravating factor.

Generally, the intended print-runs of the fifteen editions are lower than the ten thousand copies proposed for each *William* book by Molino. However, two publishers, the Editorial Molino itself and the Editorial Baguña, successfully applied for permission to publish editions of twelve thousand and ten thousand copies respectively during the period of the *William* books' prohibition (nos.6, 8). Ediciones Reguera were not far behind, with an edition of eight thousand copies in 1945 (no.7). In certain editions such as Reguera's, low price and large print-run coincided, suggesting that the regime had no objection to large numbers of people reading *Tom Sawyer*.

The comparative regularity of applications to publish editions of *Tom Sawyer*, on the one hand, and the *William* books, on the other, is similar during this era, which also demonstrates that a low intended readership, in terms of raw numbers, was not a factor in the greater leniency shown towards *Tom Sawyer*.

Judging by the information on number of pages and size of paper included in the censorship applications for *Tom Sawyer*, most of the editions are not thoroughgoing adaptations. Only four of the fourteen are under one hundred and eighty pages long, and one of these, Baguña's one hundred and sixty page 1947 edition, is

almost certainly not radically abridged since it is printed on very large paper (20cm. x 15cm.).

As far as literary prestige is concerned, there is some evidence that *Tom Sawyer's* reputation may well have counted in its favour. Literary appraisals of the work are positive, when they appear. The literary value of Ameller's edition (no.5) is adjudged to be 'notable', and that of the Molino edition is described as 'bueno'. In the case of the Molino edition, the censor adds 'humorismo sano', a description which contrasts sharply with the terms ('irreverente', 'impertinente') used to describe *Guillermo el organizador*, a mere one thousand copies of which the same publisher unsuccessfully attempted to import one month later.

Though both the *William* books and *Tom Sawyer* are dignified with the title 'novela', in the case of the former this is almost always accompanied by an allusion to the fact that the work is for children or belongs to the 'adventure' category (nos.1, 9, 13, 14, 16, 22, 24, 32). In contrast, *Tom Sawyer* is referred to as a pure 'novela' on several occasions (nos.18, 48, 49, 51), and as an 'obra' on many more (nos.12, 21, 25, 27-29, 33, 35, 37, 39, 40, 41, 44-46, 50). Only one *William* book is referred to as an 'obra', and only then indirectly (no.1). Instead, many of the censors' designations allude to the works' episodic nature (nos.4, 6, 13, 15, 26). During the period of persecution, the works are somewhat belittlingly referred to as mere 'cuentos' (nos.5, 6, 7).

The report on Molino's 1943 edition of *Tom Sawyer* (no.6) provides evidence that the work's fame was a censorship consideration, for the censor's actual assessment of the work is limited to the observation 'es un libro célebre. Me parece aceptable.' The censor of Cruzet's 1952 Catalan edition (no.12) also saw fit to mention that the book was well-known, remarking that 'nada inconveniente se aprecia en esta traducción catalana de esta conocida obra norteamericana'. A report on a derivative work submitted in the same year, *Tom Sawyer detective y otras dos narraciones*, testifies to the high esteem in which Twain was held generally, the censor describing the work's literary value as 'bueno, como todo de este célebre autor, si bien no es de lo mejor de su producción' (Appendix C, no.2).

*Tom Sawyer's* cultural status therefore seems to have militated in its favour in its encounters with the Francoist censors in the early period of the regime. Two other

important factors which distinguish it from the *William* books must be recalled, however, if its censorship history is to be more fully understood. The first is its equivocal status as a children's book, already alluded to with regard to Nausica's 1943 edition. It will be recalled that a separate body for the censorship of children's books (as opposed to comics) did not exist until 1954, and that special legislation regarding their content did not come into being until 1956 (pp.85-87, above). Until the mid-1950s, therefore, the censors could simply ignore the awkward question of whether *Tom Sawyer* was a children's book or not, if they chose to do so. The fact that there were only two explicit references to it as such in the period before 1957 seems to indicate that they considered many editions of *Tom Sawyer* to be *not* specifically aimed at children.<sup>9</sup>

The censors' reception of *Tom Sawyer* from mid-1957 onwards, described below (pp.144-68), reveals the extent to which official perceptions concerning whether the work, and the various editions of it, belonged to the category 'children's literature' became a crucial factor in the later Francoist period.

The other distinguishing feature to be borne in mind is *Tom Sawyer's* identity as a single work. Unlike the *William* books, which the censors considered to be different works within a series, translations of *Tom Sawyer* were treated as if they were essentially the same work (at least until the final years of the regime), a fact reflected in the designations used to classify the two works (discussed above). This has significant technical implications for the censorship history of *Tom Sawyer*, since it meant that after 1945 almost all editions of the work were assessed in the light of the fact that it had already been authorized in a previous edition. After the first six editions, therefore, the great majority of censorship documents relating to *Tom Sawyer* include a reference to a previous censorship report (the term used is 'antecedente').

The principal motive for installing this mechanism of referring back to previous editions of a work, which for convenience will hereafter be called 'precedent', was practical. Reliance on precedent eased the burden on the overtaxed censorship apparatus by allowing the censors to reread works in cursory fashion, or not at all, and by relieving them of the duty of writing a report describing the work. This is evident from the report on Novaro's 1956 edition (no.17), which simply reads 'nada que oponer a la anterior resolución'. The Juventud edition of 1957 (no.18) was authorized



with the similarly brief remark 'revisada esta novela, puede mantenerse la anterior autorización'.

These reports could be considered indicative of a certain thoroughness on the part of the Francoist censorship apparatus, in principle at least, since the censors were clearly *expected* to read and assess different editions of the same work. Works were thus not declared acceptable or unacceptable in an outright fashion, indicating some sensitivity to the possibility of the content, and therefore the acceptability, of a work changing from edition to edition. The fact that even identical editions of the same work had to be submitted for revision, however, suggests that the regime was at least equally alert to the possibility that changes in its own censorship criteria might render certain formerly permissible works unacceptable.

Nevertheless, the fact that a work had been authorized in an earlier edition no doubt favoured its cause, since it meant that subsequent assessments acquired the character of mere revisions. In the interests of consistency, the path of least resistance for the censor was to authorize the work again. As we shall see below, however, attitudes to individual works did sometimes change radically, suggesting that works were occasionally subjected to genuine reassessment in the light of some shift in the complex matrix of influences which affected individual censorship decisions.

The use of precedent is particularly relevant to the area of foreign literature censorship. In the case of a translated work, reliance on precedent was predicated on the assumption that all translations were essentially identical, since the censors almost always referred back to the last edition of a work submitted for censorship, despite the fact that this was usually an entirely different version of the work. Reprints of an edition by the same publisher constituted an exception to this rule. In such cases, the censors logically referred to the first application to publish the edition in question. In the more complicated case, however, of a single translation being submitted for censorship by two different publishers, the censors relied, illogically, on the usual procedure of referring to the last edition submitted for censorship. This suggests that the precedent mechanism was installed in order to monitor a work's general acceptability at any given juncture, rather than as a means of constructing censorship histories of different translations. Although the system of precedent did not change formally in the later period, when adaptations of *Tom Sawyer* for children proliferated

considerably, some censors nevertheless appear to have developed a certain sensitivity to variations of content between distinct editions of the same work which they had not displayed when the work was marketed for an adult readership, as we shall see below (p.146).

### (iii) Conclusion

*Examination of the censorship histories of Tom Sawyer and the William books in the earlier Francoist period thus brings to light certain facts which are surprising in view of the evolution of the regime generally. The most striking of these facts is undoubtedly the effective prohibition of new titles in the William series at precisely the moment when one would have expected a more liberal attitude to English literature generally to have manifested itself, as the regime sought a rapprochement with the Allies and the British cultural mission under Walter Starkie began to flourish. The successful activities of José Janés, with the collaboration of Starkie, show that the regime did indeed adopt a relatively liberal stance towards adult literature, at least of the more culturally prestigious type, translated from English in this period.*

*The fact that the regime viewed children's literature as an area requiring special rigour also explains, less directly, the much smaller degree of censorship imposed on Tom Sawyer in the early Francoist period. As the evidence of the later period demonstrates, it was only the fact that earlier editions of Tom Sawyer were not unequivocally regarded as children's publications which saved them from greater censorship.*

## Part II: The Later Period

### (i) *William* 1957-1981

When the Editorial Molino attempted to revive the *William* books at the end of 1958, it encountered no censorship difficulties, and the series enjoyed its most prosperous period in Spain: seven new titles were submitted for censorship in 1959, five in 1960, levelling out to between one and four titles in the early to mid-1960s.<sup>10</sup>

The censor of the first work to be submitted after *William's* period of banishment, *Guillermo el bueno* (no.9), employed terminology which contrasts sharply with that used in the early 1940s: 'Travesuras inocentes observadas con escrutadora mirada psicológico-analítica.' The technical ring of this assessment perhaps reflects the urge to modernization which accompanied the technocrats' rise to power in the late 1950s. Once the regime's isolationist posture was modified, it is clear that the additional xenophobia applied to children's literature in the early 1940s was relaxed, for there are no allusions to the works' foreign provenance in the later Francoist period.

Perhaps sensing that *William's* time had arrived, Molino raised the proposed print-run for the next work it intended to publish, *Guillermo el malo* (no.10), from eight thousand to ten thousand copies. As with *Guillermo el bueno*, the censor briefly summarized the book's content, limiting his judgement to 'Nada censurable. Puede ser autorizada'. This is significant, for it apparently indicates a reversion to the mode of censorship employed before the era of prohibition. The default position is once again to allow works to be published, unless they contain overt transgressions in specific doctrinal categories (assault on church, state or morality). This is in contrast to the sensitivity to the overall character of the work shown by the censors during *William's* era of persecution (see p.118, above).

The report on the next work to be published, *Guillermo el empresario* (no.11), underlines the extent to which the series' foreignness had ceased to be problematic, by suggesting an analogue for *William* in domestic children's literature: 'Aventuras y occurrences de Guillermo - una especie de Jaimito - aficionado a la lectura de novelas policíacas. Puede autorizarse.'<sup>11</sup>

The censor's assessment of another work successfully submitted in the same year, *Guillermo el pirata* (no.14), confirms the reversion to the pre-campaign

censorship criteria. The work is described as 'todo ingenuo e inofensivo', reflecting once again the return to a localized mode of censorship, according to which the work is simply mechanically 'scanned' for overtly transgressive references or episodes.

As this report exemplifies, when the censors do characterize the works as a whole, they sometimes employ approbatory epithets associated with the standard Francoist conception of the child, such as 'inocente(s)' (no.9) and 'ingenuo' (no.14). The *William* books thus seem to have miraculously recovered their innocence since the days when they were 'irreverente' and 'impertinente para España' (no.8). At one point even the protagonist himself is characterized as 'el ingenuo joven Guillermo' (no.19).

Certain terms used by the censors, however, demonstrate that after the era of persecution most of them simply accepted and even appreciated the irony of the *William* series, and the streetwise precocity of its protagonist. Representations of childhood innocence became a less necessary element of children's literature, it seems, after the era of special rigour. Thus in the 1950s and 1960s William's enterprises are no longer described merely as 'aventuras', as they were before the era of prohibition, nor simply 'cuentos' or 'lecturas para niños', as they tended to be in the negative reports, but rather as 'travesuras' (nos.9, 20, 25, 28, 29), 'diabluras' (no.16) or 'disparatadas empresas' (no.28). These terms, which are invariably used in positive reports, suggest that the regime had generally outgrown the strictly pious notion of children's literature which had established itself in the 1940s, and now had sufficient worldly and literary maturity to enter into the mischievous spirit of the *William* books.

This impression is confirmed by the terms used to describe William himself. On the one hand such descriptions, which are absent in earlier reports, conform to a certain regime stereotype. William is described, in a tone of evident approval, as 'intrépido' (no.22) and 'aventurero' (no.18), and as having a 'desbordada imaginación' (nos.28, 32) and '[un] espíritu curioso e independiente' (no.22). Whilst these descriptions do not necessarily fit the primary model of the Francoist child, they seem to indicate that the censors felt, improbable as it may seem, that William was somehow comparable to Don Quixote, and therefore worthy of their approval.<sup>12</sup> In the case of *Guillermo el malo* (1959), this connection is made quite explicitly by Palacios, who alludes to William's attempt to 'imitar y aun superar las proezas de su abuelo

español Don Quixote' (no.10). That the censors habitually perceived such a similarity is further suggested by repeated references to the fact that William is inspired to act, like the errant knight, by books (also films in William's case). Moreno de Munguía makes this point in 1959 (no.12), and Palacios repeats it in three reports in 1960 (nos.15, 16, 19). The observation resurfaces, this time unattributed, in relation to *Guillermo buscador de tesoros* (no.28).<sup>13</sup> References in these reports to the spectacular failure of William's romantically ambitious enterprises strengthen the sense of a supposed parallel between Don Quixote and William. Such references suggest that the censors may have interpreted at least some of the *William* episodes as cautionary tales on the perils of confusing fantasy (or art) and reality, a didactic interpretation often applied to Cervantes's masterpiece.

Other epithets are used about William after the era of prohibition, however, which do not apply to any orthodox Francoist model. The term 'travieso', which one would expect to be a negative quality given the stress on conformity in the primary child paradigm (see pp.19-21, above) is used twice with no hint of censure (nos.15, 18). Even more strikingly, William is described as 'graciosamente avispado' by censor Moreno de Munguía (no.21), thus directly contradicting Palacios's use of 'ingenuo' (no.19). That the protagonist of a children's book could be approvingly referred to as 'avisado' demonstrates that the strict model of childhood one infers from 1940s textbooks, based on conformity and innocence, was no longer being applied by some censors in the 1960s. The fraught censorship history of *Tom Sawyer* in the later period, however, demonstrates that although the child protagonists of children's works were no longer required to be entirely ingenuous, certain themes and types of description remained taboo in children's works because of abiding orthodox perceptions concerning childhood purity.

The attenuation of the totalitarian 1940s model of childhood also brought with it, nevertheless, a far greater tolerance of irony, a fact vividly illustrated by the *Catálogo crítico* entry for *Guillermo amaestrador de perros*:

Famosas aventuras de Guillermo, al que todo lo que intenta hacer bien sale mal, y cuando tras sucesivos fracasos se decide a hacer una trastada recibe, paradójicamente, una recompensa. Es desobediente, burlón, original y muy divertido. Los relatos son todos amenos, pero la traducción no es muy buena, y aunque no resulta una obra precisamente aleccionadora, carece de reparos

graves, pues los éxitos de las travesuras de Guillermo no tienen más intención que la de producir un efecto cómico.<sup>14</sup>

Here the epithets 'burlón' and 'desobediente', evidently at odds with the orthodox child paradigm, are used alongside the laudatory description 'original y divertido'. More notable still is the author's initial summary of the work's content, which describes Crompton's favourite narrative device of showing mischief bringing reward, and good intentions having catastrophic consequences. This ironic inversion would seem to contradict the 1956 *Reglamento*, in which various items were specifically included in order to proscribe ironic narrative schemes of this type (see p.95, above). Whilst the content of *Guillermo amaestrador de perros* does not correspond exactly to any of these items, the notion of a child succeeding because he wilfully decided to do something bad, having failed repeatedly when striving to do good, was clearly the kind of narrative scheme the *Reglamento* was designed to prohibit.

Despite this subversive narrative scheme, the author of the entry cannot help recommending the work. In the syntactically somewhat confusing last sentence, there is a sense that the author feels the need both to justify her obvious enthusiasm, by stating the purely comic intent of the work, and to avoid appearing over-enthusiastic, by mentioning the deficiency of the translation and the lack of any positively exemplary features. Overall, one gets the feeling that the author was faintly uneasy about endorsing irony in a children's work, but nevertheless found that irony irresistible. It is thus evident that by the 1960s, the *Reglamento* represented more an idealized expression of strict orthodoxy than a realistic reflection of the regime's practical attitude to children's literature.

The official censors themselves acknowledged that circumstances had changed, when Molino applied to publish two previously rejected works in 1963 (nos.26, 27). Moreno de Munguía again used the term 'avisgado' to describe William, in his report on *Guillermo hace de las suyas*, but this time added that he was 'a la verdad un poco gamberrillo, y ello acaso determinaría el dictamen negativo de que fue objeto hace diez años'. The censor's reference to a negative report 'hace diez años' is evidently an arithmetical lapse, since it is elsewhere clearly stated that the *antecedente* for the work being assessed is the report made in 1942. The post-prohibition official line on the

character of William - that he is unorthodox but ultimately harmless - is evident in the censor's double attenuation (by the use of 'un poco' and the diminutive) of the term 'gamberro', which adds to the list of unorthodox epithets applied to William in his era of greatest prosperity in Spain.

The unnamed second censor makes no mention of the work's former prohibition. This suggests he was a subordinate of the first censor, with no responsibilities for maintaining consistency, and therefore no knowledge of the past records of works he was asked to assess. His report takes the form of a bland summary, and he raises no objections to the work. It is notable, however, that his report alludes to the irritation William causes to adults: 'Se suceden las mil y una travesuras que traen de coronilla a todos los mayores de su alrededor.' Allusions to adults as victims of William's activities are a feature of various positive reports in this era (nos.29, 30, 32), suggesting that the impotence of adults in the face of William's nonconformity was not, by this time at least, considered a dangerous example to the New Race.

Moreno de Munguía's vagueness about the reasons for the initial suppression of the work ('ello acaso determinaría[...]') is evidence that the censors themselves recognised the pragmatic adaptability inherent in the system. This official acknowledgement of the flexibility of the censorship criteria is reflected in the report, by an unnamed censor, on *Guillermo el proscrito*, the second work submitted for reassessment in 1963. The censor describes the work as 'una serie de aventuras', remarking simply that 'a pesar de haber sido suspendido en el año 1944, no hay nada que oponer a ellas desde el punto de vista del presente dictamen'.

In the same report, the censor's description of Crompton's hero as 'el popular adolescente Guillermo' is an indication of the fame the series had begun to enjoy by this time. In fact, William had already been referred to as 'el famoso personaje infantil' by the censor of *Guillermo detective* in 1960 (no.17). Further testimony to the popularity acquired by *William* in the Spain of the 1960s is provided by two published sources. Gasca's book in which William is eulogised as 'uno de los personajes de la mitología popular infantil que más hondo va a calar en la mentalidad de los niños españoles' (cited p.114, above) was published in the same year, 1969, that *Cuadernos para el diálogo* dedicated a warm tribute to Crompton, who had died in January of

that year. This tribute began with the words 'casi con toda certeza podemos afirmar que Guillermo es el personaje infantil más popular de la literatura'.<sup>15</sup>

As well as remarking on the series' popularity and quality, the author of this tribute provides some critical analysis. He stresses the quintessentially English milieu of the stories, which are identified as the origin of the repressive forces against which *William* struggles for liberation: 'En *Guillermo* hay un auténtico enfrentamiento: el de la aburrida, insípida, vacía, ultratradicional sociedad inglesa con la imaginación desaforada de los niños.' Although all the epithets the censor uses to describe the provincial English society of the *William* books could be applied to Francoist Spain, his emphasis on the criticism of English mores implicit in the series may provide a further clue to the motives behind the censors' latter leniency towards the series: the more William rebelled, they might have reasoned, the more English society was shown in an unfavorable light. In practice, however, no censor ever alludes to such subtle considerations of point of view. The fact that the society implicitly criticized was not that of Spain, however, no doubt helped *William's* cause.<sup>16</sup> The question of point of view as a factor in censorship is discussed further below (pp.176, 186-98, 225).

Despite the regime's obvious willingness to rehabilitate a character who had now acquired mythical status, however, its tolerance of subversion in children's literature still evidently had limits. This is demonstrated by the censors' response to Molino's application in 1968 to publish another work apparently prohibited in the 1940s, *Travesuras de Guillermo* (no.33). The first censor's general remarks are limited to a passing allusion to the 'aventuras y desventuras' recounted in the work, and, once again, to the irritation William's activities cause to those around him.

This censor objects to two specific episodes in the work. The first, described as '[una] travesura de Guillermo que pasa de la raya', has William charging money to friends and acquaintances for the privilege of viewing his slumbering aunt. William promotes this vision as a kind of circus exhibit, and hangs a placard around the victim's neck which reads, in the translation, 'mujer gorda y salvaje'. The censor adds in parenthesis that this episode may be either modified or suppressed. He also objects to '[una] escena demasiado insinuante protagonizada por una niña de once años', but this time stipulates that the scene must be suppressed outright. The other censor of the work objects to the same two episodes, but also demands the suppression of three



additional pages 'referidas a la rata que llevó Guillermo a una Iglesia'. This latter episode was not in fact entirely removed from the final published version, though various elements were modified (see pp.187-89, below).

The documentation for this work contains two versions of the translation, identical except that only one includes the passages alluded to by the censors, demonstrating that the marked passages were in fact removed from the version which was finally authorized.<sup>17</sup> Suppressions on this scale had not been imposed on any published title in the series since before the era of outright prohibition.

The question which must be asked is whether the relatively harsh treatment of this work in 1968 can be attributed to the work itself, or whether it was a consequence of extra rigour motivated by the wider political situation. The first possibility, that the censored episodes in this work might be regarded as especially subversive, in the regime's eyes, is difficult either to demonstrate or refute. The matter could only be decided by an exhaustive comparison of the episodes in question with episodes from other works. Given the difficulties of assessing the precise degree of subversive potential in a literary episode, and the presence of imponderables such as the caprices of different censors, this procedure could hardly yield an objective result.

Some light can be shed on the matter by referring back to Molino's earlier attempt to publish *Travesuras de Guillermo*, discussed on p.118, above. It will be recalled that this edition was apparently rejected by the official censorship apparatus, despite the fact that it had been approved by two censors (Leopoldo Panero and an unnamed provincial censor). Conde rejected the work on the grounds of its foreignness, but nevertheless remarked that 'por su tema no se halla nada censurable'. The *Catálogo crítico de libros para niños* also endorsed the work generally, mentioning only 'la aparición, aunque rápida, de una niña coquetuela'. Though publication of the work was refused in 1942, this was on grounds which were at least partly pragmatic. On the other hand, it is clear that the specific objections of the 1968 censors are more numerous and more vehemently expressed than those raised by earlier arbiters of the work's value.

The general remarks made by the second censor in the 1968 application also tend to suggest that whether the work especially merited the regime's opprobrium or not, opinion had shifted against the series generally:

En rigor, el contenido de las aventuras de Guillermo, entre atolondrado e ingenioso, las escenas de hilaridad y las ironías a que dan lugar ni son recomendables ni contienen aspectos positivos y utilizables para una recta formación infantil, ya que rebasan el marco de sus capacidades.

The pious tone of this generalized attack on the *William* books is strongly reminiscent of negative reports from the persecution era, with the difference that it contains no allusion to the series' foreign provenance. The implicit tolerance, and even appreciation, of Crompton's brand of irony, perceptible in reports throughout the previous ten years, has been replaced by a flat rejection of irony as a permissible feature of a children's work.

This of course recalls the primary paradigm of the child established in the 1940s, one of the chief characteristics of which was innocence and lack of scepticism (see pp.15-16, above). In identical fashion to Item 3(d) of the 1956 *Reglamento*, the reason the censor offers for rejecting irony is, somewhat unconvincingly given the tone of general indignation, the fact that children are incapable of understanding it. The belief in the necessity of inculcating conformity in the child is undoubtedly at the root of the censor's posture, a fact demonstrated by the reasons he gives for suppressing certain passages: 'Por atentar seriamente al respeto que merecen los mayores por parte de cualquier muchacho menor, por parte de cualquier niño, debe modificarse - de no suprimirse - parte del capítulo ocho [...].'

The report on *Travesuras de Guillermo* thus seems to indicate a regression to a dogmatic posture with regard to irony and representations of nonconformism in children's literature towards the end of Fraga's mandate. Unfortunately, publication of the series became erratic after 1968, with no new titles being published in 1969 (the year of Richmal Crompton's death) or 1970. No further deductions concerning the impact on children's literature of the reactionary backlash of the late 1960s can be made based on the *William* books, therefore.

The later censorship history of *Tom Sawyer*, however, does provide further evidence for a resurgence of reactionary piety in the censorship of children's literature in the 1960s. Twain's work, however, had begun to experience serious censorship difficulties much earlier, in 1963 (the first objections arose as early as 1957), when *William* was prospering in Spain (see pp.144-68, below). These difficulties were particularly related to the equivocal status of *Tom Sawyer* as a children's book.

Considerations of literary identity therefore obscure somewhat, at least for the moment, the question of whether the reactionary backlash of the late 1960s had an impact on children's literature censorship. Many of the censors' objections to *Tom Sawyer* in the 1960s nevertheless refer to the ironical and satirical aspects of the work, as in the case of *Travesuras de Guillermo*, suggesting a general resurgence of a reactionary childhood model based on pious notions of innate goodness and innocence.

In fact, only four more *William* titles were published during the Caudillo's lifetime, all during the period in office of Alfredo Sánchez Bella. It will be recalled that censorship generally in this period was harsher, according to available evidence (p.69, above). All four *William* titles were published without difficulties, however, the report on each stating simply 'puede editarse' (nos.34-37). This suggests that the Fraga era, considered one of modest liberalization, treated children's literature rather more harshly than the Sánchez Bella era, which was generally considered to be a return to the excessive zeal of the Arias years. The evidence of *Tom Sawyer* tends to confirm that the Fraga era, during which children's literature was legally inscribed as the only area in which state censorship prior to publication continued to be obligatory, was particularly harsh on publishers of works, or editions of works, for children. Equally, although censorship of *Tom Sawyer* continued under Sánchez Bella, it was somewhat less harsh than in the Fraga era, as we shall see below.

There is plenty of unorthodox material in the first of the four *William* books published under Sánchez Bella, too, which the censors might have deemed unsuitable. Its title, *Guillermo el superhombre* (no.34) suggests the extent to which the figure of the superhero was now an acceptable commonplace of children's lore. In the work, William and his Outlaws dream up a 'utopian' civilization. In his enumeration of the ills of modern culture, William includes teachers who set exhausting homework, and he proposes that schools be abolished. Another episode has Violet Elizabeth asking the Outlaws to find her a new mother.

The fact that this work, and the other two published during Sánchez Bella's supposedly regressive mandate, received the same tersely formulaic authorization from the censors suggests that the resurgent intolerance attributed to the era did not necessarily extend to all children's books. The later censorship history of *Tom Sawyer*, described below, confirms that considerations of precedent were more important than

the overall character of the Ministry in determining the response to a given work in this period.

Moving beyond the Sánchez Bella era, it is something of a shock to discover that censorship in the area of children's literature appears to have survived until well after the Caudillo's death: the archive contains censorship documents for children's books from as late as 1983. Various titles in a new series of *William* books were published by Molino in this twilight period after Franco's death but before the end of state censorship. After 1972, publication of the *William* books was apparently suspended by Molino until 1980. In 1980 and 1981, two comic-book versions of single episodes from the *William* books appeared (nos.38, 39). These incorporated stills from the television series based on Crompton's books, whose airing on Televisión Española in the autumn of 1980 Molino clearly hoped to exploit: the second title of this kind, *El baile de disfraces*, was proposed in a print-run of thirty thousand copies, an unprecedented figure for the series.

The imminent airing of the television series was announced in an article in *El País* in 1980, in which the profound impact of the *William* series on the post-war generation in Spain is clearly acknowledged.<sup>18</sup> By now, of course, the subversive elements of the works are openly exalted, with the author referring to William himself as 'un fiero batallador contra el adulto', 'un orgulloso proscrito' and 'un desenfadado anarquista' (p.4). The growing interest in the socio-literary phenomenon itself of *William* in Spain, at least in certain sectors of society, is also evident in this article:

Guillermo ha sido y es uno de los principales temas de conversación en los círculos *progres* españoles. Un recuerdo que alguno saca a lo tonto, como disculpándose por el detalle sentimental, y destapa la curiosidad de otros aficionados, que rebuscan entre los libros de casa aquellos viejos ejemplares rojos que valían siete pesetas y luego subieron a veinticinco, o quizá encuentren unos blancos, de tamaño más grande, que salieron tras un intervalo editorial. (p.5)

As nostalgic interest in the phenomenon of the *William* books in Spain grew, however, the number of new readers the series was attracting had begun to decline. In an article in *El País* in 1990, Luis Antonio del Molino acknowledged as much, remarking that the television series revived sales of the books briefly, but that *William's* popularity generally was in decline by the 1980s.<sup>19</sup> This steady shrinkage of the market for the *William* books in their traditional format was reflected in Molino's

editorial decisions: five new translations in the old format, all published in 1981, were produced in print-runs of only six thousand copies each (nos.40-44), as against ten thousand in the works' heyday in Spain, and thirty-thousand in the case of the comic-books using stills from the television series.

Despite the fact that the *William* books had become little more than a sociologically curious nostalgic artefact for many Spaniards, it is nevertheless clear that the submission of the seven works published after Franco's death formed part of an official censorship procedure. This is deducible from the use of the word 'autorizable' in the documents relating to the last five works. Moreover, the documentation for *El baile de disfraces*, the second comic-book title, contains an allusion to Decree 195/67 (BOE 13 February 1967), which established the continuation of *censura previa* for children's books. It seems, therefore, that certain publishers' concerns regarding the ambiguity of the provisions of the 1978 Constitution regarding children's literature were well-founded: a vestigial form of *censura previa* for children's books clearly did exist at least until 1981 (the censorship catalogue in the Archive at Alcalá in fact lists 1983 as the last year for which files exist, as stated above).<sup>20</sup> Precisely what kind of mechanism of control was employed in these post-transition years, and whether this mechanism deserves to be described as 'censorship', can only be ascertained by further investigation.

#### (ii) *Tom Sawyer* 1957-1981

In stark contrast to the *William* books, the censorship history of *Tom Sawyer* in the later Francoist period is considerably more turbulent than in the earlier era. Of the fifty-one separate applications to publish editions of Twain's work between 1957 and 1980 which have been consulted for this dissertation, two were initially rejected outright (nos.27, 35). Another two resulted in the censors stipulating that the editions in question could only be published if the words 'Para adultos' appeared on their covers (nos.28, 31). In the case of four other applications, the censors concluded that the editions could only be published with suppressions (nos.20, 39, 40, 50). There is evidence that a further four applications resulted in suppressions being imposed, though no censor's report is present in the documentation (nos.58, 59, 63, 66). In other

cases, applications were only successful after disagreements between censors had been resolved (nos.34, 37).

The first edition to encounter difficulties was that of the Editorial Ferma, submitted in December 1957 (no.20). The censor's report on this edition reads as follows:

Colección Horizontes Juveniles, 8: Una serie de aventuras y anécdotas escolares que reflejan la vida real de los muchachos del Oeste americano del siglo pasado. Tiene alusiones a las prácticas religiosas protestantes en cuyo ambiente se desarrolla la acción y bastantes supersticiones propias de los niños y de los esclavos de aquella época. Su protagonista, un niño simpático, travieso y a veces muy alocado, coquetea con las niñas.

Reparos: En las páginas 56 y 57 debe suprimirse todo lo tachado referente a la escena del beso en los labios que para ser 'prometidos' se dan el niño protagonista y una niña. Resulta inconveniente en un libro para niños de ocho a doce años como el presente. En otras ediciones como Juventud, Sopena se ha suprimido. Es lástima que esta obra no se haya presentado en galeradas como debía presentarse toda obra editada en España. Aceptado con reparos.

Beneath this typed report, a further sentence written by hand has been added: 'Conforme con el criterio anterior por tratarse de un libro infantil'. This additional remark is signed 'F.Aguirre', who, as subsequent reports demonstrate, was clearly the chief children's literature censor at the time. Aguirre also dated his remark 28 August 1957. The process of resubmitting the work having altered the translation and printed the edition was clearly a laborious one: the date the work was finally authorized is given as 23 December 1957, almost four months after Aguirre had ratified the censor's original decision.

Significantly, the censor first establishes that this edition is being marketed as a children's book, by referring to the collection to which it belongs. This classification implies a lower cultural prestige, evident in the censor's description of the work as 'una serie de aventuras y anécdotas escolares', in contrast to the prestigious terms 'novela' or 'obra' used in previous reports. Later in the report, the censor is even more specific about the edition's target-readership, referring to 'un libro para niños de ocho a doce años'. The censor has probably gleaned this information from the publishers blurb on the book's dustjacket, in which the age group at which the collection was aimed may well have been specified.

In the earlier period, explicit allusions to *Tom Sawyer* as a children's work in censorship reports were relatively rare. As we shall see below, from Ferma's edition

onwards such allusions became much more common, as the work's equivocal status as a children's book became the central consideration in the censors' responses to the work. At this stage, it is important to note that the problem of *Tom Sawyer's* literary identity began to surface in censorship documents in the mid- to late 1950s, in the same period that a special body and specific legislation for children's literature were implanted by the regime.<sup>21</sup> This fact helps to explain why *Tom Sawyer* began to encounter problems at this time whilst the *William* books did not: the inscription of children's literature as a special category brought with it the necessity to decide firmly whether a given edition was intended for children, and therefore whether it was subject to the special norms, or not. This did not affect the *William* books, which had always been viewed as works for children, and which had accumulated positive precedent on that basis. *Tom Sawyer's* positive precedent, on the other hand, had been acquired on the general assumption that the work was not specifically intended for children.

The censor's specific objections to Ferma's edition concern unorthodox religious practices and descriptions of juvenile flirtation. Significantly, the only specific suppression imposed by the censor relates to the latter feature. The implications of these specific objections are discussed further in Chapters 4 and 5.

This particular censor's awareness that different editions of the same work often do not have identical contents is evident from his observation that two other editions of *Tom Sawyer* do not contain the scene he has marked for suppression. Based on the incomplete evidence of the archive material alone, this assertion is difficult to verify, and some of the evidence suggests it is in fact incorrect. Juventud's application to publish its 1957 edition (no.18), to which the censor must be referring, does not include a copy of the work. This is because a later application to publish the same version was made in 1966 (no.31). The copy initially submitted was thus transferred to the file relating to this latter application. It is clear that both applications relate to the same version: the copyright date on the work included in the 1966 file is 1957, and the later application cites the earlier one as its *antecedente*. Yet the version included in the 1966 application does in fact contain the scene in which Tom kisses Becky. Juventud's application to publish the work in 1966, which was in fact refused, is discussed below.

Returning to the report on the Ferma edition, the censor's allusion to an edition by Sopena which did not include the kiss is equally confusing. The first application to publish *Tom Sawyer* by Sopena for which documentation can readily be located was made in January 1958 (no.21), after the censor of Ferma's edition had made his report. A previous edition by Sopena has clearly become lost in the system, a deduction confirmed by the report on the documented edition submitted in January 1958 (no.21), which reads 'autorizada muy recientemente la importación de esta obra, no existen ahora motivos para variar el criterio'. The number of this previous application, or *antecedente*, is not given, however, and no copy of the work is included, thus making it impossible to investigate the censor's claim. Later applications by Sopena, discussed below, refer to a different version of the work (see pp.149, 158, below).

Whilst it is possible that the version imported by Sopena did not contain the kiss, it is certainly true that other previous editions of *Tom Sawyer* did include it (nos.1, 3, 6, 9, 10 and 19, and possibly other unconsulted editions). This reveals again the importance of the target-readership as a censorship consideration, since it suggests that the mere portrayal of children kissing was not in itself objectionable in a work of fiction for adults. The possibility that Spanish *children*, on the other hand, might read such a portrayal, was considered unacceptable. Thus in the earlier period, when *Tom Sawyer* was not explicitly marketed as a children's work, and when the special status of children's literature had not yet been fully established, the kissing scene was never suppressed by the censors. As soon as *Tom Sawyer* begins to be explicitly marketed as a children's book, however, the kiss provokes repeated objections on the part of the censors, as is demonstrated by reports on many subsequent editions (nos.20, 23, 31, 33, 34, 35, 37, 39, 44, 49), which are discussed below.

The arbitrariness inherent in the system meant that such objections were not made at all consistently, however. Thus Queromon's 1960 application to import Novaro's illustrated, considerably abridged Mexican translation of *Tom Sawyer* received unqualified approval, despite the fact that the kissing scene is fully rendered in both words and a colour illustration (no.22). Another illustration clearly shows Tom, Huck and Joe frolicking naked in the Mississippi. It is clear that this version is aimed at children, a fact explicitly acknowledged by the censor, Batanero, whose report states simply: 'Extracto de la novela para jóvenes. Puede autorizarse'.



Misgivings concerning *Tom Sawyer's* suitability for children reemerge in the report on the FHER edition of 1960 (no.23), however. It is immediately evident that this edition, comprising only sixty-four pages, is specifically for children, a fact the publisher in any case explicitly states in his application. The censor, Ibarra, makes objections to various specific episodes in the work. These objections fall into three specific categories: religious unorthodoxy, juvenile sexuality and criminal behaviour. The specific implications of these objections are discussed in Chapters 4, 5 and 7.

It should be noted here, however, that the number of episodes the censor objects to in the FHER edition is greater than in the case of the Ferma edition. Moreover, the objections to children fantasizing about and reaping the benefits of criminal behaviour had not been raised, it will be recalled, since the report on Nausica's 1942 edition (no.3). Thus although the regime's opposition to *Tom Sawyer* was not consistent in this era, the censors' reasons for objecting to the work nevertheless seemed to be growing ominously in number.

On this occasion, however, the censor was overruled by her superior Aguirre, who added in ink below Ibarra's report the words 'creo que se puede permitir su publicación'. Aguirre's unqualified approval of this version apparently demonstrates inconsistency on a scale almost comparable with Conde's overnight volte-face with regard to *Guillermo el proscrito* (p.121, above). Although both the Ferma and FHER editions are specifically for children, and although the respective censors of each object to various episodes, Aguirre chooses to heed the advice of one and ignore the other. The FHER edition, the kiss included, was duly authorized for publication in March 1960.

Aguirre himself made the report on the next edition to be submitted for censorship, by the Editorial Bruguera (no.24). Once again Aguirre authorizes the work, summarizing it as 'trastadas de chicos y algunas reflexiones morales del autor que neutralizan lo que pueda haber de poco edificante en la conducta de los chicos'. Above the word 'autor' in this sentence, the word 'adaptador' appears in red ink, revealing that either Aguirre himself or another party suspected that moralizing additions had been made by the adapter of the work.

Certain features of the copy submitted for scrutiny initially suggest that this suspicion was reasonable. Even before examining the text itself, it is clear that this

edition does not purport to be a straightforward translation. The publishers honestly describe it as '[una] adaptación de José María Lladó'. The tone of the blurb on the dustjacket suggests that the publishers have done all they can to mould the work to the orthodox model of a children's work:

Como se comprende, tratándose de una obra humorística - aunque, eso sí, salpicada del más sano y plácido humor - distan mucho estas aventuras de lo truculento y espectacular. Son, sencillamente, 'cosas de chicos', pero cuya lectura resulta muy entretenida gracias al estilo fluido, natural y desenfadado del autor, que intercala de cuando en cuando breves y atinadas reflexiones morales. En suma, se trata de una obra muy adecuada para la juventud.

In fact, the presentation of this edition as an adapted work, and the suggestion that moralizing passages have been inserted, seems to have been a clever ploy on the part of the publishers, for this edition does not include any such additions. Moreover, the episodes of *Tom Sawyer* which elicited most objections throughout the work's censorship history are all retained in this edition, including the kiss between Tom and Becky. In the version of this edition held in the Biblioteca Nacional, the text of the dust-jacket submitted for censorship does not in fact appear, suggesting that it was for the censors' benefit only. Although certain distortions of effect are evident in Lladó's version, they are certainly no greater in number or degree than in other translations which purport to be faithful.

One such translation is María Alfaro's, described as a 'traducción directa' in the Sopena edition of 1960 (no.25). Alfaro's translation had first been published in an edition by Aguilar in 1948 (no.9), in which it was also described as a 'versión directa'. Analysis reveals that this version is not in fact as faithful to the original as it was claimed to be (see p.282, below). As with Aguilar's 1948 edition, the Sopena edition of 1960 encountered no censorship difficulties, and was approved on the grounds of precedent. Once again, however, the *antecedente* consulted by the censor was the previous edition submitted for censorship, that of Bruguera. This was clearly less logical than reference back to Aguilar's 1948 edition would have been, since the version published by Bruguera was likely to have been significantly different from Alfaro's.

The next edition submitted for censorship (no.26) was a reprint of FHER's adaptation (no.23), to which censor Ibarra had objected but which was ultimately authorized by Aguirre. This time the work was assessed by Moreno de Munguía, the

same censor who described William as 'un simpático personajillo' and 'graciosamente avisado' (nos.12, 21). Perhaps unsurprisingly, given this evidence of his relatively liberal outlook, Moreno de Munguía approved this edition without comment.

Reviewing the censorship history of *Tom Sawyer* in the final years of Arias Salgado's period in office, therefore, we can see that the regime began to object to the work because it was being marketed specifically as a children's book. These objections were inconsistent, however, and resulted in only one actual suppression.

Contrary to expectations, given Fraga's much vaunted *apertura*, opposition to *Tom Sawyer* did not disappear under the new Minister, however. In fact, as the reports discussed below reveal, Fraga's period in office turned out to be the most difficult, in practical terms, for prospective publishers of Twain's masterpiece. In the report on the first edition submitted under Fraga, by the unfortunate Editorial Ferma (no.27), a new censor, whose signature is unclear but appears to spell the name 'Sartorius', alludes explicitly, and in reproachful terms, to the recent tendency towards marketing *Tom Sawyer* as a children's work:

A través de múltiples ediciones se ha querido hacer de *Las aventuras de Tom Sawyer* un libro infantil. Sin embargo no puede lograrse esto ni mucho menos eligiendo de las aventuras los pasajes macabros (desenterrar los cadáveres con vistas a venderlos), ni las escenas de crímenes y falsedades en la persona de Joe. Tal como se ha resumido la obra resulta además confusa y totalmente inadecuada para los niños. No debe editarse.

There can be no doubt that this outright rejection represents additional rigour, on the part of this particular censor at least, since this adaptation does not appear, as a whole, to be more blatantly unorthodox than previous ones authorized by Aguirre and his cohorts. Whilst it is true that it includes portrayals of criminal behaviour perpetrated by Injun Joe (as did Marco's 1942 edition, approved without comment), it not only suppresses the kiss, but also removes any romantic connection at all between Tom and Becky, alluding to them merely as 'amigos'. This is in stark contrast to Queromon's 1960 adaptation imported by the Editorial Novaro (no.22), authorized by Batanero under the supposedly more severe auspices of Arias Salgado, in which the kiss is rendered in words and pictures.

Other documentation in the file relating to Ferma's application provides an insight into the procedures used by publishers for appealing against an unfavorable decision. An attached note, dated 16 July 1963, invites a representative of Ferma to

a meeting in the *Consejo de Publicaciones Infantiles y Juveniles*, in order to 'resolver el expediente titulado *Las aventuras de Tom Sawyer*'. Also included in the file is a letter from the Madrid representative of Ferma, who attempted to put pressure on those assessing the appeal by insinuating that if it failed, the publishers might be driven out of business. The letter claims that Ferma had already printed off six thousand copies of their edition, expecting it to be authorized. An exhaustive breakdown of expenses incurred follows, and the letter then concludes:

Al mencionar los gastos la Editorial Ferma quisiera recabar de V.I. la atención más venbolente (sic) para que al ser revisado dicho expediente fuera en favor de la admisión de dicha obra para su autorización y venta, ya que de no efectuarlo tendría consecuencias lamentables.

Gracia que espera alcanzar de su reconocida bondad etc., Madrid 27.9.63.

Ferma's pleas were in vain, however: a note from the *Comisión de Infancia y Publicaciones Infantiles* to the *Jefe de la Sección Bibliográfica*, to whom all appeals were obviously sent, states simply 'con relación al citado expediente, debo hacer constar que la Secretaría Técnica de esta Comisión ha considerado debe denegarse el permiso para la edición del mencionado título, por haber infringido las normas establecidas sobre las publicaciones infantiles y juveniles'. This note is dated 9 October 1963.

The section for recording appeals ('recursos') on the main censorship document was duly completed, on 15 October 1963, with the words 'vistos los fundamentos alegados y el nuevo informe, se declara concluso el expediente manteniendo la denegación anterior, adquiriendo carácter firme la resolución'. For the first time in the Franco era, therefore, permission to publish an edition of *Tom Sawyer* was apparently denied outright.

Later in the same year, however, Ferma submitted the same work for censorship again, suggesting that the initial negative decision was not as unconditional as the earlier documentation suggests. The censor responded to this new application (no.28) as follows: 'No parece que se han suprimido los pasajes inadecuados. No obstante, con la advertencia "Lectura para Adultos" puede editarse.' Whereas only the proofs of the text were sent in the first application, the second includes a copy of the final printed version of the edition. On the cover of this copy, which had not yet been

bound to the pages of the text, a sticker bearing the words 'Lectura para Adultos' has been affixed.

This compromise outcome is presumably the result of negotiations between the censor and the publisher at some time between the two applications. From the censor's report, it seems that the publishers were told that the work could only be sold as a children's book if certain suppressions were carried out. Having claimed, probably truthfully, that they had already printed off all six thousand copies of the work, the publishers were left with no alternative but to accept the censor's demand that the edition be explicitly marketed as a book for adults only. This would entail reprinting only the cover, or perhaps simply affixing a sticker to all six thousand copies, as they did with the copy submitted for censorship. Either way, this would be a much less costly process than reprinting the whole edition having carried out suppressions.

The prospects of commercial success for this edition in its final form must have been somewhat doubtful, however, since in every respect apart from the warning on the front cover, it purports to be a children's book. The dustjacket bears a colourful illustration depicting a scene from the book, and although the narrative is recounted principally in textual form, illustrations in the style of a comic-book also feature regularly throughout. It is possible the publishers may have hoped that at least some copies of the work would sell precisely because of the incongruous warning on the cover, which would no doubt excite the curiosity of some prospective readers.

Turning to the next edition submitted for censorship, by Llovet in 1964 (no.29), the documentation reveals again that the question of *Tom Sawyer's* identity as a children's book had a crucial bearing on the regime's response to it. Llovet's application seems to have been sent initially to the department responsible for adult books. This is deducible from a handwritten annotation on one of the censorship documents which reads 'seguramente es edición infantil o juvenil - pasarlo a Montserrat'. In fact, the uncertainty on the part of the author of this note is confusing, since it is clearly stated in the application that the edition is aimed at 'jóvenes [de] ambos sexos'.

The superficiality of the mechanism by which editions were authorized on the strength of precedent is again revealed in the report on Llovet's edition. Despite the fact that Ferma's second application (no.28) involved a particularly unorthodox edition,

on which a special stipulation was ultimately imposed, it was nevertheless cited as the *antecedente* for the entirely different Llovet edition. The censor's report on the latter edition thus reads simply 'procede mantener la autorización concedida en el año 1963, con el número de expediente 6620, a la obra *Aventuras de Tom Sawyer*'. The Llovet edition was therefore authorized as a work in the 'juvenil' category, quite illogically, on the basis of an edition which had specifically been excluded from this category.

Comparing the two editions, features of the Llovet version suggest that it was aimed at a rather older readership than that envisaged by Ferma, a fact which may have favoured it in the censor's eyes. The Llovet edition is much less abridged and includes an analytical introduction to the text. Significantly also, the proposed price of the edition is one hundred and twenty-five pesetas per copy, as against twenty pesetas per copy for the Ferma edition.

Though it is apparently intended for somewhat older readers, however, the Llovet edition significantly alters the original text by suppressing or modifying certain passages, and by adding moralistic narratorial interjections which completely alter the effect of certain episodes. Although these interventions no doubt made this edition more acceptable to the censors, it is significant that the violent or criminal episodes objected to by the first censor of the Ferma edition were retained in Llovet's adaptation.

Clearly the suitability of a work for children was judged according to the overall balance, in terms of orthodoxy, of the elements in it. Episodes which were unacceptable in the context of one edition could thus be rendered acceptable in another if enough neutralizing moralization was included.<sup>22</sup> This notion of an equilibrium between more and less acceptable elements is consistent with Aguirre's report on Bruguera's 1960 edition (no.24), in which the censor clearly draws on such a conception when he refers to 'reflexiones morales que neutralizan lo que pueda haber de poco edificante en la conducta de los chicos'.

In early 1965, Bruguera's Catalan edition was authorized for publication on the strength of precedent, and no comment was made by the censor concerning its content (no.30). It thus may have seemed as if the polemic created by the promotion of *Tom Sawyer* as a children's book, which had appeared to be approaching crisis point with the initial refusal of Ferma's edition at the beginning of Fraga's mandate, had finally

abated. In fact, opposition to *Tom Sawyer* as a children's work reemerged immediately, and during the two succeeding years returned to the level it had reached in the early stages of Fraga's period in office. Ironically, this new bout of intransigence coincided with the enactment of Fraga's supposedly liberalizing *Ley de Prensa*.

In early 1966, Juventud applied to reprint their edition of *Tom Sawyer*, which had been authorized on the basis of precedent in 1957. This time, however, their application was flatly rejected, at least initially (no.31). The censor's report for this edition consists of several pages of text. The first begins with a single type-written sentence: 'Versión completa de la famosa obra que satiriza una época y un sector de la sociedad del Oeste americano, a través de las aventuras de su protagonista y sus inseparables amigos Huck Finn y Joe Harper.'

Beneath this various handwritten additions have been made. The first reads: 'Se acompaña informe de la obra. No debe autorizarse.' The author of the handwritten remarks then apparently began to write the word 'denegada', but only got as far as the first five letters before crossing the word out. Beneath this, a further note has been added in the same hand: 'Puede autorizarse, indicando en la portada: Para jóvenes' (underlined in original).

At first glance, this last annotation appears to be a mistake: it seems more plausible that the censor meant to write 'adultos' in place of the word 'jóvenes'. There is another possible explanation, however: this wording may indicate that the censor felt that the work could be marketed in the 'juvenil' category (readers over fourteen years old), but not in the 'infantil' category (readers under fourteen).

The document was signed by Sartorius, the censor who had begun the new opposition to *Tom Sawyer* in the Fraga era by rejecting Ferma's 1963 edition (no.27), and dated 18 January 1966. A further handwritten addition, which states simply 'conforme' is signed 'Fajardo' and dated 4 November 1966. It is probable that Fajardo was Sartorius's superior and probably the head of the children's literature section, and that his endorsement for the censor's final decision was required after Juventud had appealed against their edition being initially rejected. The nine-and-a-half months which elapsed between Sartorius's initial report and Fajardo's final agreement that the edition could be printed with a warning on the cover is testimony to the power of the

censorship apparatus to prevent publishers from functioning efficiently by embroiling them in lengthy negotiations.

The 'informe' referred to by Sartorius begins with the general observation that 'el carácter de la obra, en la que apenas se respetan los valores esenciales, hace su lectura inconveniente para niños y adolescentes'. The rest of the report takes the form of a list of page references to offending passages in the edition, which according to the censor 'demuestran su inconveniencia'.

The number of passages thought worthy of objection in the case of this edition is much greater than in the case of the first reports in which censors expressed disapproval of episodes in *Tom Sawyer* (nos.20, 23) in the later period, and far exceeds the censor's objections to Nausica's 1943 edition, which was regarded as specifically intended for children. Rather than merely objecting to the scene in which Tom and Becky kiss, for example, Sartorius cites thirteen pages which he feels are objectionable because they portray 'amores prematuros'.

During the Arias years, there was only a single explicit objection to an anti-clerical or anti-religious episode in the work, on the part of the censor of FHER's 1960 edition (no.23), Ibarra, who had described the scene in which Tom releases an insect during a church service as 'algo irreverente'. In 1966 Sartorius, on the other hand, objects to four separate episodes in which religious figures or practices are mocked. This is despite the fact that the censor mentions, on two occasions, that the mockery is directed against specifically Protestant targets.

Sartorius also cites other episodes in which non-religious figures in authority are ridiculed. As in his report on Ferma's 1963 edition (no.27), though in more detail here, he goes on to single out criminal and deceitful behaviour as unexemplary characteristics of *Tom Sawyer*. His disapproving references to the exaltation of Huckleberry Finn's eccentric lifestyle and personality constitute a new category of objection to *Tom Sawyer* altogether, however.

In response to the initial rejection of their application, Juventud offered the following defence of *Tom Sawyer* in a letter to the censor:

[La Editorial Juventud expone:] que la mencionada obra de Mark Twain es un clásico de la literatura universal para todos los públicos, que se edita constantemente en todos los países; que figura en nuestro fondo editorial desde 1957 y en la actualidad existen en el mercado español - y, por tanto,



debidamente autorizadas - por lo menos una docena de ediciones, por tratarse de una obra de dominio público; que en la reedición que desea publicar Editorial Juventud, en todo caso, podría figurar la indicación 'Para jóvenes' en la cubierta.

Vistas las razones aducidas, no dudamos que V.I. resolverá favorablemente la petición formulada en el presente recurso.

Here the tone of the publishers' response is markedly less deferential than Ferma's letter in support of their 1963 edition, reflecting a growing willingness to confront the censor as the apparently less authoritarian era of Fraga wore on. Juventud point out the inconsistency of the censor in seeking to prohibit publication of a work which is already available in numerous editions, including Juventud's own.

It is clear that Juventud are aware that it is the presentation of *Tom Sawyer* as a children's book which is at the root of the censor's opposition, however. When they cite the work's classic status in defence of their application, they are careful to specify its universal appeal. Nevertheless, they offer to include a warning that their edition is 'para jóvenes'. This suggests that the publishers understood that the difficulties were being caused by the fact that this edition could be construed as belonging to the 'infantil', as well as the 'juvenil' category. Whether Sartorius's original stipulation that a notice saying 'para jóvenes' was a mistake or not, Juventud clearly received an official communication that publication of the edition was conditional on excluding it from the 'infantil' category only. It seems that Fajardo ultimately noticed and cleared up the confusion, however, since he wrote on the letter from the publishers 'autorizado para ADULTOS'.

In September 1966, Juventud submitted exactly the same text for reconsideration. The documents relating to this second application are held in a different file (no.33), despite the fact that the final verdict on this edition (Fajardo's authorization of an adult edition) only appears in the file relating to the first application (no.31).

A note on the application document in the later file assures the censor that 'en la cubierta de esta obra se indicará: "Para mayores de 14 años"'. From his report, it appears the censor is unaware that the publishers have opted to make this concession, however:

Esta obra fue sometida a lectura previa el 10 de enero del presente año, con número de expediente 165-66. Fue rechazada. En vista de que no ha habido

supresiones de ningún tipo en esta nueva presentación, se recurre a las tachaduras. Por lo tanto, esta obra podrá autorizarse en edición infantil y juvenil siempre que se tachen las frases marcadas en rojo en las páginas: 23-24, 33-37, 39-43, 58-60, 122, 128-31, 142, 156, 219 y 221, y se supriman las ilustraciones de las páginas 120 y 143.

Oddly, beneath this report, the handwritten remark 'no comparto ese criterio' appears, signed by Fajardo and dated 13 September 1966. What is meant by this is unclear, but in any case Fajardo ultimately granted Juventud's application, on condition that they include a warning that their edition was meant for adults only, on 4 November 1966. Had this condition been duly fulfilled by Juventud, the result would have been somewhat incongruous, given the publishers' name and the fact that they were well known to specialize in literature for children.<sup>23</sup>

At almost exactly the same time, Sartorius and Fajardo were also deciding the fate of an application by Bruguera (no.34) to reprint their Castilian version by José María Lladó, authorized by Aguirre in 1960 (no.24). Sartorius's report states that Tom's adventures 'son el punto de partida para una crítica de la sociedad americana de la época del autor que deja bastante malparados los valores esenciales'. He then points out that eight pages are missing from the copy submitted for censorship, which in this case is no longer present in the file. This time, the number of pages indicated by Sartorius in his list of objections totals almost fifty, in five different categories. It is evident that his objections refer to the same episodes of *Tom Sawyer* to which he had previously taken exception in the case of the Juventud edition.

Interestingly, Sartorius does not demand that the episodes he has specified should be suppressed outright. Rather, he concludes that in order for the edition to be publishable, 'deben atenuarse las escenas indicadas'. Despite this relatively flexible stipulation, however, Fajardo's remarks, written in red ink below Sartorius's report, betray a certain impatience with his junior's over-zealousness with respect to *Tom Sawyer*. 'Todo esto lo considero excesivo. Trámite de orden del jefe del servicio. Aunque lo mejor será devolverlo a la editorial por incompleto.'

Significantly, the documentation relating to this application contains no allusion to the question of whether this particular edition of *Tom Sawyer* was intended for children or not. The fact that it was submitted at all suggests that Bruguera intended it as a children's edition, since under the 1966 Ley de Prensa, publishers were no

longer required to submit adult books for censorship. In a later application to reprint the same edition (no.46), Bruguera did in fact classify it as 'juvenil', though by then the edition had accumulated sufficient positive precedent for this classification not to count against it. If it was not explicitly presented as such in the 1966 application, this might explain Fajardo's opinion that Sartorius had judged it too harshly. Whatever Fajardo's reason for disagreeing with his junior, his recommendation that the matter should be decided by 'el jefe del servicio' is indicative of how seriously the censors were taking the question of *Tom Sawyer's* identity as a children's work.

Fajardo's proposal that the Ministry should defer making any decision by citing a mere technicality, the fact that an incomplete copy was submitted for censorship, is also highly revealing. It suggests that the censors themselves were fully aware that the censorship apparatus was, or had become, a mere bureaucratic obstacle to the free functioning of the publishing industry, and that they consciously, and somewhat cynically, employed purely bureaucratic mechanisms in order to keep the publishers in check. This self-perception of the censors as mere 'bureaucratic saboteurs' of the publishing industry is likely to have increased as the regime's ideology became increasingly inconsistent, and as the rationale behind the existence of state censorship at all become ever more questionable.

No final decision on this edition appears on any of the censorship documents in the file, perhaps suggesting that Fajardo's advice was followed, and that Bruguera, for whatever reason, chose not to resubmit their edition immediately. This edition was successfully submitted in later years, however (nos.40, 44, 46, 49, 53, 60, 64, discussed below).

In late April 1967, Sopena applied to reprint their edition of María Alfaro's translation of *Tom Sawyer* (no.35), authorized on the basis of precedent in 1960 (no.25), and previously published without censorship difficulties by Aguilar (no.9). As with the Juventud and Bruguera reprints, however, this time the censor's report is harshly critical of the work:

Versión íntegra de la conocida obra, en la cual se hace una crítica demoledora de los valores más esenciales, de las instituciones y la sociedad americana del pasado siglo, a través de las aventuras de Tom y su pandilla. El prólogo no va dirigido a menores.

The censor then lists over thirty pages of references, and concludes 'la obra es así totalmente negativa para lectores infantiles o juveniles y no debe editarse para ellos si no se suprimen o atenúan los pasajes señalados'.

Though the signature suggests that Sartorius is not the author of this report, the similarity of its wording to that of other reports by him strongly suggests that the censor of this edition had consulted, and agreed with, Sartorius's judgements of *Tom Sawyer* (both 'valores esenciales' and 'amores prematuros' are used here, as in the reports on the Juventud and Bruguera editions). The list of objections to this edition also overlaps substantially with those drawn up by Sartorius with reference to the Juventud and Bruguera editions.

There is no indication, therefore, that opposition to *Tom Sawyer* in the late 1960s was the consequence of a single censor's capricious objection. If anything, the new censor is even more virulently opposed to the work. His description of *Tom Sawyer* as 'una crítica demoledora de los valores esenciales' which is 'totalmente negativa para lectores infantiles o juveniles' seems to denote a growing indignation on the part of the censorship apparatus generally that publishers should dare to suggest the work as suitable for children.

It appears that Fajardo, like Sartorius, had been assigned to other duties, since he was apparently not responsible for passing final judgement on this edition. This time, the message 'completamente de acuerdo con el dictamen anterior' appears beneath the censor's report. This is not the reaction we would expect from Fajardo, given his response to Sartorius's report on the Bruguera edition, and in any case the signature beneath this remark, which unlike Fajardo's judgements is typed, is clearly not his. Publication was duly denied on 5 May 1967. The senior censor's total agreement with the negative report on this edition, in contrast to Fajardo's less intransigent posture, confirms that Fraga's 'liberalization' was not reflected in appointments to positions in the children's literature department of the censorship apparatus.

In a pattern which was by now becoming familiar, Sopena wrote a letter to the censor appealing against the decision on the grounds that their edition was not intended for children: 'Dado que este libro está incluido dentro de la colección "Biblioteca Sopena", de carácter meramente literario, rogamos no lo considere como

obra de carácter juvenil o infantil, ya que está destinada para personas adultas.' This letter is dated 18 May 1967.

Presumably as a result of Sopena's letter, a stamp bearing the words 'juvenil o infantil' which appears on the first page of the censorship report has been crossed out. Sopena's claim that their edition was never intended for children is not entirely convincing, however. On the one hand, it is true that they were clearly anxious to indicate that this was not an abridged version or a full-scale adaptation of *Tom Sawyer*, since they included a notice declaring 'edición íntegra' on the inside of the back cover. On the other hand, however, the front cover of their edition, which carries a comic-style picture of Tom in a cemetery, certainly suggests that the publishers also intended to catch the eye of younger readers. Furthermore, it is unlikely that the publishers would have submitted their edition for censorship at all if they had intended it solely for adults, since the law no longer required them to do so. Sopena clearly did not have sufficient confidence in their claim that the edition was solely for adults to risk simply publishing it and defending its status as an adult book if difficulties ensued.

Ultimately, the censors were clearly convinced by Sopena's argument, since the edition was authorized for publication, as an adult work, on 18 June 1967. The fact that there was no stipulation that the work should bear an 'adults only' warning suggests that the inclusion of Sopena's edition in a collection not specifically aimed at children convinced the censors that it was less likely to be read by a young readership.

At this point, it is convenient to consider the question of whether the growing opposition to *Tom Sawyer* in its later period, which reached its height in the mid- to late 1960s, is reflected in the censorship histories of other works. We have already seen that the only *William* book to encounter difficulties in the later period was *Travesuras de Guillermo*, authorized with significant suppressions at the end of 1968. A useful control case is also provided by *The Adventures of Huckleberry Finn* (Appendix C, no.6), which Sopena applied to publish simultaneously with *Tom Sawyer* in April 1967. Both Sopena's applications to publish Twain's twin masterpieces were assessed by the same censor. After summarizing the plot of *Huckleberry Finn*, the

the censor lists multiple objections, divided into eight headings, referring to over forty pages of the three hundred and fifty-two page edition submitted by Sopena.

The largest number of objections grouped under a single heading relate to what the censor calls 'burlas ya irónicas, ya sarcásticas, de la religión', a category of objection which figures prominently (although less so) in negative reports on *Tom Sawyer*. Other headings, however, describe individual episodes, some of which are somewhat surprising targets for the censor's opprobrium (see pp.247, 259, below).

Concluding his report, the censor makes some rather more general observations, in a tone very similar to his assessment of *Tom Sawyer*:

El prólogo no va dirigido, ni mucho menos, a lectores de corta edad. La obra, como otras de este autor, es negativa de principio a fin para menores. Sólo suprimiendo o paliando notablemente las partes indicadas sería autorizable como obra juvenil.

As with Sopena's *Tom Sawyer*, the formula 'de acuerdo y conforme con el dictamen anterior', typed beneath the report, is used to ratify the censor's decision. The handwritten words 'autorizado en edición no infantil ni juvenil' appear in the section where the final result of the application is recorded, and the words 'juvenil o infantil', stamped on the front of the censorship document, were duly crossed out. The final date stamp on the document is 16 June 1967.

Although investigation of *Huckleberry Finn* has been considerably less exhaustive than in the case of *Tom Sawyer*, the evidence so far examined suggests that the censorship histories of both works were determined by the same factors. Like *Tom Sawyer*, the full-length version of *Huckleberry Finn* was not marketed as a children's book in the early Francoist period, or at least it was not perceived as such by the censors at this time. Early reports thus refer to the work as a novel, and in at least two assessments its similarity to the Spanish picaresque novel was mentioned (nos.3, 4). In the case of Molino's 1943 edition, the documentation includes a section in which the censor was asked to identify the genre of the work. He chose the category 'literario', rather than 'infantil'. Where they appear, assessments of the work's artistic value are positive in this early period.

The report on Sopena's edition suggests that as in the case of *Tom Sawyer*, confusion concerning *Huckleberry Finn's* equivocal status as a children's book led directly to the work's censorship difficulties in the later Francoist period. After 1966,

it should be remembered, submission of adult works for censorship was optional. Publishers could thus have only two reasons for submitting a literary work for censorship: either they felt the work was potentially troublesome, and thus wanted assurance that the edition could not be seized if it were denounced by some reactionary group, or they felt that the work was, or could be viewed as, specifically intended for children, in which case they were obliged to submit it.

It is evident that, as in the case of *Tom Sawyer*, there was sufficient doubt concerning the categorization of *Huckleberry Finn* for the publishers to feel it necessary to submit it for censorship. They are likely to have been aware that numerous full-length editions, some dating back to the 1940s, were in circulation, and that the work *per se* was therefore not considered unacceptable.

The censor's report on Sopena's *Huckleberry Finn* alludes to the unacceptability of 'otras obras de este autor'. It is likely that the censor only had *Tom Sawyer* in mind, however, since the only other works by Twain which were published repeatedly were the derivative narratives *Tom Sawyer detective* and *Tom Sawyer en el extranjero*. Versions of both works were also submitted by Sopena in April 1967, in a single volume (Appendix C, no.7), and both were viewed as less pernicious by the censor, for reasons which reveal the root cause of the regime's objection to *Tom Sawyer* and *Huckleberry Finn* as works for children. After briefly summarizing the two works, the censor remarks that 'ambas historias tienen más atenuado el sello de ironía destructiva propio del autor'.

Despite this relatively positive general assessment, the censor nevertheless cited two episodes, one from each narrative, which he felt required suppression if the volume was to be published as a children's book. Both of these suppressions can be placed in the category of religious objections and are thus discussed in Chapter 4. As with *Tom Sawyer*, and again despite a comic-style illustration on its cover, Sopena claimed in a letter that the volume was not intended for children. The work was duly authorized 'en edición no infantil ni juvenil' on 26 May 1967.

The conditional authorization of this volume in 1967 can be contrasted with the unconditional imprimatur bestowed on Nausica's *Tom Sawyer detective y otras dos narraciones* in 1943 (see p.130, above). In the case of Nausica's edition, the censor remarked that 'el tercer cuento ridiculiza, sin maldad, a la secta presbiteriana

protestante y el puritanismo norteamericano'. He nevertheless considered that the volume was 'en todo publicable'. In that case, however, the censor classified the volume as 'literario', as opposed to 'infantil'.

Responses to all three of Sopena's applications in May 1967 thus demonstrate the general point that after 1966 particularly, there was an automatic tendency to consider editions of Twain's works as specifically aimed at children. This was partly because they were now being more explicitly marketed as such, as the names of the collections they were included in clearly indicate, but more importantly it was because the censorship procedure now incorporated the necessity to distinguish between works for adults and works for children.

Confirmation that the age of the target readership was the principal factor in deciding whether an edition of *Tom Sawyer* could be published or not in the later period is provided by Aguilar's application to reprint volume one of Twain's *Novelas completas y ensayos* in February 1966 (Appendix B, no.32). The censor's report reads simply 'procede mantener las autorizaciones concedidas, y dado que es manifiestamente una edición para adultos, extender la autorización a *Las aventuras de Tom Sawyer*'.<sup>24</sup> Eighteen months later, Aguilar also successfully reprinted their 'Colección Crisol' version of *Tom Sawyer* by María Alfaro, in an edition which, like its predecessors in the same collection, included versions of *Tom Sawyer detective* and *Tom Sawyer en el extranjero* (no.38). At one hundred and fifty pesetas, and in a collection with a reputation for seriousness and sobriety, this edition would not have been considered to be especially intended for children (though the fact that the publishers submitted it at all again betrays their unease about whether it might be regarded as such).

An important moment had passed in the censorship history of *Tom Sawyer*, however, in the period between the publication of Aguilar's two expensive compilations. The publishing house Selecciones de Reader's Digest had submitted a version of the work in an edition which included translations of Baroness Orzcy's *The Scarlet Pimpernel* and James Hilton's *Lost Horizon* (no.37). Though the volume was expensive (two hundred and twenty-five pesetas), a relatively large print-run was proposed (fifteen thousand copies), and the name of the collection it was to be



included in (*Libros Eternos para la Juventud*), left no doubt as to its identity as a children's work.

Accordingly, the censor made a series of objections to the edition, under headings which are by now familiar, and concluded that 'debe eliminarse o paliarse notablemente todo lo indicado, para editar en colección juvenil'. A second, presumably more senior figure endorsed this judgement: 'Fundamentalmente de acuerdo con el dictamen anterior. Esta obra clásica, para editarse expresamente como juvenil, conviene que sea prudentemente adaptada. Aunque mejor sería autorizarla para mayores.'

A third party added a further note, however, which reads 'autorizado previa consulta con el Director General'. This remark is dated 24 July 1967. It is thus clear that the question of the suitability of *Tom Sawyer* as a book for young readers was taken to the highest levels of the censorship apparatus, though why this happened at precisely this moment is unclear. The Director General in question did not take long to decide the work's fate: the final unconditional authorization for this edition is also dated 24 July 1967.<sup>25</sup>

With the approval from on high of the SRD edition, the balance was tipped decisively in favour of *Tom Sawyer* as a work in the 'juvenil' category. From that moment on, editions submitted which were regarded as belonging to this category were invariably authorized without suppressions, even if the censor had objected to certain episodes (see nos.44, 46, 48, 49, 51). As had happened two years earlier, in the era of Sartorius and Fajardo, a schism thus developed between the ever-zealous, lower-ranking censors, and the increasingly pragmatic more senior figures. This is clearly appreciable in the reports on Bruguera's applications to publish *Tom Sawyer* in its 'Historias Selección' collection. Bruguera applied to publish this version every year between 1971 and 1975 inclusive, and it was authorized each time. In 1971, 1972 and 1973, however, these authorizations followed a pattern: the initial censor or censors marked passages for suppression or attenuation and stipulated that the work should bear an 'adults only' warning if these modifications could not be carried out; a more senior figure ignored this advice and authorized the work, without modifications, in the 'juvenil' category (nos.44, 46, 49).

The Editorial Everest's two applications to publish their adaptation of the work in 1973 further illustrate the schism between junior and senior censors with regard to *Tom Sawyer's* acceptability as a work in the 'juvenil' category (nos.48, 51). In his report on the first of these applications, the first censor points out that Everest's adaptation is especially unsuitable for young readers. He refers to objectionable passages on eighty-one pages, and recommends the outright prohibition of the work as the most preferable course of action. A second, more pragmatic censor recommends that the work can be authorized, but only for adult readers (above fourteen years of age). The decisive judgement of the third censor reads as follows: 'Es una adaptación. Parece lógico autorizarla al igual que precedentes adaptaciones (juvenil).'

The third censor's 'logic' here seems to be a euphemism for giving way to the tide of positive precedent that adaptations in the 'juvenil' category had accumulated since the SRD edition in July 1967 (no.37). It seems likely that the *Director General* whose opinion was sought on that occasion had determined that *Tom Sawyer* was suitable as a work in the 'juvenil' category. It is clear that the extent to which the work was adapted had little effect on this ruling: although both SRD's and Bruguera's editions are described as adaptations, it is clear from the censor's list of objections that little or no effort was made to sanitize these editions in order to make them particularly appropriate for National-Catholic children.

The censor of Everest's second application five months later, having consulted the earlier application, clearly realized that consistency had become the dominant concern, and therefore that 'en buen sentido, es dado pensar que para esta reimpresión se decida por la autorización' (no.51). S/he nevertheless cites the grave-robbing and murder episode as particularly objectionable, confirming that this fundamental section of the work was at the root of orthodox unease concerning its suitability for children. This fact was explicitly recognised by the censor of the Editorial Boga's 1973 edition (no.50), María Carmen Rute, whose description of this edition neatly summarizes why the regime objected to many abridgements of *Tom Sawyer*: 'Con el fin de incluir la presente obra en colección infantil, el adaptador ha reducido la misma a la mínima expresión dejando en pie los reparos más graves del original, dado que constituyen el nudo del relato.'

In the case of this edition, the censor's recommendations were not overruled, and suppressions were imposed, because the edition was felt to belong to the 'infantil' rather than 'juvenil' category.<sup>26</sup> Similarly, the first censor's objections to Plan and Bruguera's 1969 editions, the first to be specifically designated as 'infantil' rather than 'juvenil', were upheld by the senior censor or censors, and suppressions were imposed. The only means of publishing *Tom Sawyer* in the 'infantil' category in this era was to adapt it almost beyond recognition, a fact demonstrated by Fénix's eight-page 1969 edition, which the censor grudgingly authorized despite complaining that 'es una adaptación que prácticamente en nada conserva el nivel de la obra original'. The censor's supreme lack of insight into the regime's own responsibility for the grossly simplified adaptation in front of him is perhaps typical of the blindness of authoritarian regimes to the negative consequences of their own activities.

A pattern thus emerges for the era 1967-1973: in this period, *Tom Sawyer* was invariably authorized as a work in the 'juvenil' category, although junior censors continued to object to it as such, but suppressions could be and were still effectively imposed on editions considered to belong to the 'infantil' category. Considerations of consistency, ever more important as the rationale behind the regime began to look increasingly less coherent, caused this pattern to be disrupted on one occasion, however. It was decided that EPSC's application in 1971 to publish their theatrical adaptation of *Tom Sawyer*, in the 'infantil' category, had to be approved because the text was already being performed by the *Compañía del Teatro Municipal Infantil de Madrid*. Since the text had already been approved for performance in front of large numbers of children, despite containing the grave-robbing and murder incident (described as the 'escena clave' by the censor), it would seem ridiculously inconsistent to do anything other than authorize the text without suppressions. The deep-seated orthodox fear concerning the absorbing power of the book is once again evident, however, in the second censor's remark that 'para lectura, rebasa lo infantil', suggesting that he felt that reading the words would somehow have a more profound effect than merely hearing exactly the same words with an accompanying visual enactment.

Another edition whose characteristics can be regarded as unique, and which therefore does not fit neatly into the evolving pattern of *Tom Sawyer*'s censorship

history, is that published by Salvat, submitted for censorship in March 1970 (no.42). This edition formed part of a collection sponsored by the *Ministerio de Información y Turismo*, jointly published by Salvat and Alianza Editorial. The precise identity of this collection is most clearly conveyed by reproducing the self-definition included on the reverse of the title-page:

Esta colección de Libros RTV, singular en el mundo por su lanzamiento y su tirada, constituye una aportación decisiva para difundir la cultura y para promover el libro en España.

A este fin, el Ministerio de Información y Turismo convocó un concurso entre editores privados. Como consecuencia de él, la realización de los Libros RTV fue adjudicada a la propuesta conjunta de Salvat Editores S.A. y de Alianza Editorial S.A., los cuales acordaron reunir los Libros RTV en la Biblioteca Básica Salvat.

There is nothing about this edition which suggests that it is specifically intended for children. In fact, it incorporates a scholarly prologue by Julio Manegat, who reiterates the assertion in Twain's own prologue to *Tom Sawyer*, that the work can be appreciated by readers of all ages. Nevertheless, the publishers' assertion that the government-sponsored collection is 'singular en el mundo por su lanzamiento y por su tirada', though somewhat hyperbolic, is not an entirely empty one, since the censorship document reveals that the intended print-run of this edition was a massive four hundred thousand.

Thus although this edition may not have been explicitly aimed at children, its enormous print-run and low price, for the era, of twenty-five pesetas might have been expected to count against it in the eyes of the censors. This was not the case, however, since the edition was authorized without additional comment, on the grounds of precedent, by Moreno de Munguía on 4 March 1970.

It is likely, however, that the inclusion of *Tom Sawyer* in the series had already been agreed in separate negotiations with the Ministry, since it was the official sponsor of the series. It is possible that all works in the series had to be submitted for *consulta voluntaria* in order to avoid the embarrassment of a government-sponsored edition being denounced by some reactionary group. The very fact that the government should explicitly subsidise an edition of *Tom Sawyer* confirms the evidence of other adult editions from the era, such as Aguilar's, that *Tom Sawyer* was considered wholly acceptable, even recommendable, for adult consumption. Unlike the Aguilar editions,

however, the unprecedented size of the print-run and low price of the Salvat edition also demonstrate that by this time *Tom Sawyer* was considered appropriate even as a text in the populist category, an area traditionally policed with additional zeal by the censorship apparatus. This tends to confirm that it was the age of the intended readership - not its size or level of education - that was particularly important in determining the area of effective operation of the Francoist censors in later years.

The documentation relating to *Tom Sawyer's* censorship history after Sánchez Bella's period in office, as in the case of the *William* books, is less complete than for earlier periods. The record for each edition of *Tom Sawyer* published after mid-1973 contains only the application document submitted by the publishers. The final verdict of the censors is recorded on this document, but there is no accompanying report. This seems to suggest that censorship of this work, at least, became a formality after the Sánchez Bella era.

Perhaps significantly, however, several of the applications from this era include translation proofs in which passages have been marked for suppression (nos. 58, 59, 63, 66). It is unclear whether these suppressed proofs are contemporary with the applications themselves, or whether they have been carried forward from previous applications. It is thus not possible to say with any certainty, until more detailed comparison of editions has been carried out, whether censorship of *Tom Sawyer* disappeared during and after the mandate of Pío Cabanillas, or whether it continued but without being formally recorded in the documentation. Some of the suppressions imposed on these editions are discussed in subsequent chapters.

It is also worth noting that the great majority of the applications which have been consulted for this period were to publish editions in the 'juvenil', rather than the 'infantil', category. This suggests that even if *Tom Sawyer* was not formally censored from the end of Sánchez Bella's period in office onwards, previous eras of censorship had nevertheless already determined the character of the editions being marketed.

## **Conclusion**

*The arrival of the technocrats in government in 1957 is generally regarded as a turning point towards greater liberalization in the regime's history. Nevertheless, it marks the beginning of Tom Sawyer's difficulties with the Francoist censors. This fact*

*is explicable, to some extent, in terms of the evolution of the censorship apparatus: the overall liberalization of the late 1950s and early 1960s, it will be recalled, was not clearly reflected in the area of censorship because of the continuing presence of the reactionary Gabriel Arias Salgado as Minister of Information and Tourism.*

*The fact that the regime became even more hostile towards Tom Sawyer during the period in office of Manuel Fraga Iribarne could not have been predicted on the basis of either the regime's overall evolution, or the history of Francoist censorship generally, however. This is because this increased hostility was a direct result of the special conditions which applied to children's publications. The special status of children's literature for censorship purposes had been definitively inscribed by the specific legislation drawn up to govern it in the mid-1950s. From that period onwards, the censors were obliged to decide firmly whether editions of Tom Sawyer were specifically intended for children or not, and to censor according to specific, more rigorous norms if they felt they were. It was not until the Ley de Prensa of 1966, however, that the status of children's literature as a category which required greater, rather than merely different, censorship was explicitly proclaimed, as obligatory prior state censorship for every other class of work was abolished. This coincided with a tendency on the part of the publishers to market both adaptations and full-length editions of the work in a manner which suggested they were at least partly intended for a child readership.*

*The contrasting fate of the William series in the later period can be attributed to the fact that, unlike Tom Sawyer, it had accumulated positive precedent as a children's work, before the definitive inscription of children's literature as a special category in the 1960s. In the light of William's prosperity in this period, despite its similarity in many respects to Tom Sawyer, it seems likely that the difficulties experienced by the latter work were at least partially caused by its change of status from adult to children's book. As we shall see in Chapters 4 to 7, certain inherent features of Tom Sawyer also probably caused it to be regarded as less acceptable as a children's work than William in the eyes of the Francoist censors.*

*Finally, although the censorship histories of both works are generally surprising in the light of the evolution of the regime generally, the suppressions imposed on Travesuras de Guillermo in 1968 suggest that censorship rigour in the*

*area of children's literature generally did increase somewhat (though it did not return to the levels of the 1940s) as a result of wider political events.*

## NOTES:

1. Whilst there is no direct evidence that the regime consciously suppressed the greater affluence of other nations reflected in literary or artistic representations, Gubern provides examples of the censor's willingness to present other nations in an unfavorable light, even if this meant permitting portrayals of human depravity. Thus in relation to Francisco Regueiro's 1965 film *Amador*, Gubern remarks that 'el padre González Fierro, censor dominico, ofreció a Regueiro la solución de convertir al sádico protagonista (tolerable si la acción transcurriera en Londres, observó el censor, pero no en España) en un vulgar ladrón de monederos de mujer' (Gubern, p.211). An equal zeal to preserve the national image was shown in the case of the 1956 film *Calle Mayor*, whose director Juan Antonio Bardem was forced to 'añadir un texto inicial asegurando que cuanto ocurría en la película podía suceder en cualquier país' (Gubern, p 160).
2. Quoted in Peter Hunt, *Criticism, Theory and Children's Literature* (Blackwell: Cambridge, MA, 1991), p.60.
3. After the collectivization of publishing houses and the general political upheaval in Barcelona in 1936, the Editorial Molino continued to function, but with considerable difficulty. One of the founders, Pablo del Molino, therefore emigrated to Buenos Aires, where he set up an Argentine branch of the Editorial in 1937 (personal communication with the Editorial Molino).
4. Fernández López twice refers to a 1942 edition of *Travesuras de Guillermo* (pp.123, 230 (footnote)), strongly suggesting that the work was in fact published in this year. The Biblioteca Nacional catalogue contains no reference to such an edition, perhaps indicating that it was published illegally. Neither does the catalogue contain any reference to a 1942 edition of *Los apuros de Guillermo*, however, which as we shall see was authorized (albeit after an undetected previous rejection) in that year (present chapter, p.121). Further investigation would evidently be required in order to explain these anomalies.
5. This is not to say that Francoist censorship never had a retroactive effect. It will be recalled that the Nationalists set up 'comisiones depuradoras' in 1937 to oversee the removal of pornographic and socialist texts from libraries and bookshops (p.53, above). After this purgation, however, it seems that periods of particular censorship rigour were characterized largely by attempts to obstruct the publication of works or editions which the publishers presented during the period in question, at least on an official level. The right-wing 'vigilante' attacks on bookshops in the 1970s are one example of unofficial attempts to carry out retroactive purges, however (see p.70, above). Editions of works were also occasionally seized, despite having already passed through the censorship apparatus, on the strength of a complaint from a sufficiently influential individual or group. This practice was particularly common during the 1950s (see p.61, above). The censors often attempted to dodge the charge of inconsistency these seizures inevitably invited, by passing a judgement of 'silencio administrativo' on those works it suspected might attract controversy, but whose outright prohibition they felt they could not justify in the prior censorship phase. One of the few genuinely liberalizing features of Fraga's 1966 *Ley de Prensa* was that it explicitly established, in Article Four, that a judgement of 'silencio administrativo' exempted the publisher from further responsibility in the case of a subsequent complaint against a work ( Beneyto, p.416).



6. José de Quintana, 'Lecturas de la juventud', *Solidaridad Nacional*, 12 May 1943, p.2. A copy of this article was generously supplied to the author of this dissertation by the Editorial Molino.
7. Numbers 22, 23, 26, 39, 41, 43 and 45 are all, or all appear to be, considerably adapted versions of *Tom Sawyer* (the last being a version for the theatre), whilst number 2 appears to be the only definite adaptation from the earlier period. In the case of some of the editions here cited, this deduction is based merely on the small number of pages, since not all editions have been consulted. Ambivalence concerning *Tom Sawyer's* identity as a children's book persists in Spain today, and is reflected by the fact that some editions of the work are held in the Biblioteca Nacional in Madrid, whilst others are housed in the specialist children's literature library now to be found in Alcalá de Henares. If a particular criterion has been applied in order to decide which editions belong in which library, it is not immediately apparent: each contains both full-length and adapted versions of *Tom Sawyer*. Some of the editions which are listed in the censorship catalogues of the Archivo General de la Administración del Estado do not appear to be present in either library. Equally, some of the editions held in the libraries seem to have left no trace in the censorship catalogues.
8. Mark Twain, *Las aventuras de Tom Sawyer* (Barcelona: Lauro, 1945). I have been unable to locate the censorship file for this edition. Like Lauro's edition of Santainés's translation, Mateu's edition in their 'Cinco Mejores Obras' collection (no.19), using the same translation, shows no obvious signs of being intended for an exclusively young readership. Mateu also used the same translation in their earlier 'Juvenil Cadete' collection, however (no.10), which was evidently aimed at children. This is a further indication of the ambivalence regarding *Tom Sawyer's* status as a children's work, discussed below.
9. Other than Nausica's edition, Carlos Ameller's 1943 edition (no.5) was the only version of *Tom Sawyer* which the censor alluded to, somewhat indirectly, as a children's work in the earlier period. Even in the case of this ninety-six page adaptation, however, the censor's classification is far from unequivocal: although he alludes to 'aventuras infantiles' he also calls the work a 'novela', as mentioned above, and he classified the work as 'literario', rather than 'infantil o juvenil', on the document accompanying his report.
10. The Biblioteca Nacional catalogue reveals that *Guillermo el deshollinador* and *Guillermo en días felices* were published in 1959, as well as those works listed in Appendix A (nos.10-14). I have been unable to locate the censorship documents for these two works.
11. Replying to my query concerning the identity of 'Jaimito', the Editorial Molino responded as follows: 'Jaimito era un personaje del cine mudo cómico inglés o americano (no recordamos el nombre inglés). Llamamos 'jaimito' en lenguaje coloquial a la persona que hace muchas tonterías. No consta esta definición en enciclopedias.' It is also probable that the censor was referring to the comic of the same name, in which the eponymous protagonist, much younger than William, was habitually involved in a series of mischievous enterprises (José Soriano Izquierdo and others, *Jaimito* (Valencia, Editorial Valenciana, 1944-[?])).

12. On the pedagogic approach towards *Don Quixote* and the figure of Cervantes during the regime, see Fernando Valls, *La enseñanza de la literatura en el franquismo (1936-1951)* (Barcelona: Antoni Bosch, 1983), pp.144-49. Valls concludes his discussion as follows: 'El estudio de Cervantes [...] siempre estuvo rodeado de motivos extraliterarios. Los juicios rozaban casi siempre la exaltación retórica y el análisis serio y meditado de la obra brilló por su ausencia'. Luis Montañés Fontenla twice compares José Mallorquí's western series *El Coyote* to *El Quixote*, in his laudatory article on the series in *Bibliografía Hispánica* (Montañés Fontenla, 1950, pp.23, 25). Nichols points out that this was 'an obvious attempt to bolster the thrillers' respectability' (Nichols, p.219). Given the regime's appropriation of the figure of Cervantes for use as a patriotic icon, any perceived similarity to *Don Quixote* in a work presented for censorship was likely to have militated in its favour.
  
13. It will be recalled that this allusion to the literary inspiration for William's enterprises is in fact probably plagiarized from the *Catálogo crítico de libros para niños* entry for an entirely different work, *Travesuras de Guillermo* (see p.120). This suggests the parallel between *William* and *Don Quixote* may have been noticed much earlier than the official reports suggest, but was only remarked upon in such reports once *William* had become fully acceptable to the regime.
  
14. Gabinete de Lectura Santa Teresa de Jesús, *Catálogo crítico de libros para niños: 1962-1965* (Madrid: Servicio Nacional de Lectura, 1967), p.103.
  
15. J.M.Guelbenzu, 'Guillermo o la imaginación', *Cuadernos para el diálogo*, 64-65 (January-February 1969), 40.
  
16. The assumption that William's activities could not invite imitation because his world was too far removed from that of the Spanish child is refuted by Savater, who was William's age (eleven) when he read the series, in its heyday in Spain at the time. Savater acknowledges that the peculiarly English features of William's world 'debieran habernos distanciado soberanamente de las peripecias de Guillermo, haciéndonoslas poco menos exóticas que si ocurriesen en el Congo o en Indonesia'. In Savater's case at least, the exotic milieu was more than compensated for by William's personality and outlook, however: 'Precisamente, porque era de los nuestros podíamos admirar su espléndida peculiaridad; el hecho de que compartiese nuestros gustos, nuestros deberes y nuestras limitaciones, nos permitía gozar como propios de sus triunfos' (Savater, 1976, p.65).
  
17. Fernández López identifies the suppressions imposed on the 1968 edition of *Travesuras de Guillermo* (pp.230-31), and remarks that the 1942 edition (see present chapter, note 4) is identical (that is, the same passages are missing). She attributes the suppression of 'The Show', the episode involving Aunt Emily, to the translator, remarking that it was imposed 'sin motivo aparente' because 'en realidad este relato no incluye ningún elemento "de interés" para la censura de la época ni es especialmente difícil de traducir por su argot o construcciones anómalas' (p.230). Such erroneous assumptions regarding the characteristics of censorship in a given era illustrate clearly the usefulness of a detailed analysis of the censorship norms applied to particular areas of literature. I have not consulted the 1935 edition, but at 272 pages (though a smaller format than the 1968 edition) it seems unlikely to contain suppressions. Later editions published in 1979 and 1980 are the same format as the 1935 edition, and yet consist of only 255 pages. This suggests, disturbingly, that the censored version was the one used for these later editions.

18. Rosa Rivas, 'Un chico para la eternidad', *El País* (Semanal), 28 September 1980, pp.4-5.
19. Xavier Moret, 'Travesuras en España', *El País*, 6 September 1990, p.20.
20. Cendán Pazos reports that several publishers raised doubts concerning the precise implications of the 1978 Constitution for children's literature censorship at a symposium on children's literature held in El Paular in 1979 (Cendán Pazos, pp.64-65). The Constitution established that the right to freedom of expression 'no puede restringirse mediante ningún tipo de censura previa'. One of the limits on this freedom was, however, 'el respeto [...] a la protección de la juventud' (see Article 20, sections 2 and 4 in 'Constitución 27 diciembre 1978 (no.2836)', *BOE*, 311 (29 December 1978), in Aranzadi, 1978, p.3129).
21. The decisive piece of legislation with regard to the problematic categorization of *Tom Sawyer* is Article Six of the 1956 *Reglamento*. This established that all publishers submitting works intended for children were obliged to state on an accompanying document, amongst other things, the sex and age of the intended readership of the work (section 2). It will be recalled that the *Reglamento* also allowed the censors to define editions as intended for children merely by dint of their appearance, however, so that the problem of definition could potentially apply to all editions of the work.
22. Adding text to literary works in order to produce a balance of elements more agreeable to the censors does not appear to have been a common practice generally, and the Llovet edition of *Tom Sawyer* is the only instance of the practice in the works consulted for the purposes of this dissertation. The notion of a balance of elements is confirmed, however, by the fact that works whose overall character was especially positive were permitted certain liberties, particularly in more marginal categories of prohibition such as portrayals of violence (see Chapter 7, below).
23. It is evident from the copies of the work held in the Biblioteca Nacional that after 1957 Juventud did not succeed in publishing their version of *Tom Sawyer* until 1969. I have been unable to locate a censorship file relating to this latter publication, however.
24. The 'antecedente' cited for *Tom Sawyer* by the censor of this edition refers to no.31, Juventud's initially unsuccessful application to publish María Teresa Quintana's version in the 'Colección Juventud', although it would have been more logical to allude to an earlier edition of the Aguilar volume, such as no.13. The work was thus apparently prohibited at the time the censor made his report on Aguilar's 1966 edition, explaining why he implicitly alludes to the work as proscribed in his report. Interestingly, the report on Aguilar's application to reprint exactly the same volume, in May 1967 (no.36), cites the 1966 edition as the 'antecedente', though there were several other versions published in between, suggesting that the censors were beginning to pay more attention to the separate identity of specific editions. This suggestion is borne out by later censorship reports, discussed below.
25. The censor concluded his report on Hilton's *Lost Horizon* (*Horizontes perdidos*) with the following assessment: 'Es tema delicado y difícil para jóvenes en general. No obstante, estimo que la obra puede ser leída por los de edad mental más adelantada y, en ese sentido, es autorizable (juvenil y de adultos).' *The Scarlet Pimpernel* was authorized with suppressions on fifteen pages. The suppressed passages variously refer

to the French Revolution (and particularly allusions to the vengeance of the people), duelling, kisses, women as unvirtuous, violence and, perhaps surprisingly, antisemitism (see pp.258-63, below, for further discussion of the censors' response to racism).

26. In the section of the application document in which the publishers were invited to define the 'carácter' of the edition, Boga responded 'juvenil: niños y niñas'. This is a somewhat equivocal classification, since the *Decreto Ministerial* of 1955, which first categorized children's comics, established that a 'revista infantil' was aimed at 'niños y niñas'. The term 'niño/a' was thus associated with the 'infantil', rather than 'juvenil' category. The publisher's attempt to place the work in the 'juvenil' category was clearly thwarted by the censors, who exercised their right to classify the work according to its content and presentation, as established in Articles Two and Three of the 1967 *Estatuto*.

## CHAPTER FOUR: RELIGION

El protestantismo inmigró subrepticamente en nuestra península a través de los libros, [...] y el aluvión europeo sobrepasó las barreras pirenaicas, trayéndose el liberalismo, el socialismo, el sindicalismo, el comunismo, el enciclopedismo, el modernismo y otros principios insalubres para los espíritus.

(A. Garmendia de Otaola)<sup>1</sup>

### Introduction

Given the clerical dominance of the censorship apparatus for children's literature, it is unsurprising that a significant proportion of the censors' objections to children's works concern supposedly disrespectful allusions to men of the church or to religious ceremony or scripture. As has been suggested above, however, the fact that the butt of Twain's and Crompton's satire is the Protestant Church raises intriguing questions regarding the censors' sensitivity to point of view. It will be recalled that there are a number of possible responses on the part of the censors to satirical depictions of Protestant clerics or ceremonies: such depictions might have been deemed unacceptable merely because they mention the adherents and practices of a rival denomination; they might have been considered acceptable because they tended to mock a rival denomination; or they might have been . . . thought unacceptable because they portray mockery of religious authority, of whatever type. On the basis of the regime's ideology as it is evidenced in propaganda texts, it is difficult to predict which of these possible responses the censors may in fact have adopted.

It will also be recalled that the legislation governing children's literature enacted in 1956 prohibited 'descripciones *tendenciosas* de ceremonias o costumbres correspondientes a cultos de otras religiones o confesiones *que puedan inducir a error o a escándalo*' (my emphasis; see p.87, above). Strictly speaking, therefore, literary allusions to unofficial denominations were only proscribed if they tended actively to promote a non-Catholic version of religious truth. At least in its legislation, the regime thus seemed to show a sensitivity to point of view with regard to the portrayal of unofficial religions in children's literature. Typically, however, the statute includes a vague, 'umbrella' category which can be used to justify arbitrary official intervention: the stipulation that any religious allusion leading to 'escándalo', rather than merely 'error', is proscribable allows the censors to suppress more or less anything which provoked their own indignation.

As we shall see, the censors' approach to this question fluctuated somewhat according to the level of rigour being applied in particular periods and, relatedly in the case of *Tom Sawyer*, according to whether or not they considered the work to be specifically intended for children.

(i) Mockery of the clergy

Unequivocal evidence that derisive allusions to men of the cloth were indeed suppressed is provided by the proofs of *Guillermo el organizador* (no.8), which Molino unsuccessfully attempted to publish in both 1943 and 1949. It will be recalled that the censor cited the fact that 'el obispo, sacerdotes son "pastores" protestantes' as a reason for disapproving of the work. The evidence of the proofs initially appears to suggest that strenuous attempts were made, presumably by the publishers, to remove as many references as possible to Protestant clergymen. In Chapter 1, in which William plays a prank on a visiting bishop, this is achieved by replacing all allusions to religious figures with lay equivalents. Thus the 'obispo' who is the victim of William's mischief becomes a 'ministro', and the 'pastor', who in the original is entertaining the bishop, becomes the 'alcalde' (typed proofs, pp.10-20). Correspondingly, 'la parroquia' is changed to 'el municipio' (p.16). Other details, which render the modified text somewhat incongruous, remain unchanged, however, such as the fact that the 'ministro' gives a speech on alcoholic abstinence (though the convergence of state and Church in National-Catholic Spain makes this scenario less improbable). A more obvious incongruity, an illustration of William perpetrating his prank on a dog-collared figure, has been crossed out altogether, however (p.14).

It is unclear who carried out these modifications. Given that he mentions no such interventions in his official report, it seems unlikely that they were purely the work of the official censor. They may represent a last-ditch attempt on the part of the publishers to render the work fit for publication. The most plausible explanation is that the censor marked certain sections for suppression, which the publishers then modified, but the censor felt uncomfortable with the work anyway and thus ultimately chose to ignore the modifications and prohibit it outright. This theory is supported by the fact that certain sections of text have been both ringed in crayon and crossed out in ink, suggesting intervention by more than one person. Ultimately, the question of

the authorship of the suppressions, though interesting, is not crucial, since irrespective of whoever carried them out, the aim was to sanitize the work according to the prevailing conception of National-Catholic ideology.

The modifications in Chapter 1 of the proofs thus might initially appear to reflect an attempt to remove Protestant clerics from the narrative because the censor had objected to their mere presence. Later in the work, however, various scenes take place in church. Clearly, the substitution of lay equivalents in such episodes would be impracticable, and the Protestant vicar therefore does appear. Significantly, however, an overtly derisory allusion to him has been modified: '*El pastor predicó un sermón muy poco convincente sobre la abnegación*' (p.175) Here the phrase I have italicized has been crossed out in ink in the proofs.<sup>2</sup> This strongly suggests that the censor's declared objection to the mere presence of Protestant clergy may not in fact have been wholly sincere, for the publishers clearly felt that it was the mockery of religious authority which was likely to be deemed proscribable here. Other evidence relating to religious scripture and ceremony, discussed in the following section, tends to confirm this impression.

It is thus probable that the substitutions in Chapter 1 were in fact carried out in order to eliminate the mockery of religious authority which the episode implied, rather than the mere presence of Protestant clerics. These modifications, though not sufficient to make the work publishable in the adverse climate of the 1940s, prove that mockery of religious authority, particularly, was an absolute taboo in children's literature: the author of the suppressions was clearly striving to retain some of the subversive impact of the narrative by including a figure in authority, but felt that the text would be more acceptable in National-Catholic terms if the ridiculed figure represented civil rather than religious preeminence. The fact that the personage who became the target of mockery was English no doubt helped to mitigate the subversive potential of this scene in the eyes of the censors. It would be interesting, nevertheless, to ascertain whether mockery of civil figures was also more acceptable than the ridicule of clerics in children's works set in Spain.

Interestingly, allusions to the local vicar are similarly modified in the proofs for *Guillermo el pirata* (no.14), published without censorship difficulties in 1959. The original passage in the translation reads as follows:

El *Vicario* fue a echar una nota al buzón de las cartas, hizo sonar la campanilla, y se fue, quedando estupefacto al verse perseguido, atrapado y sacudido por el cuello por su nuevo *feligrés*, quien al mismo tiempo le comunicó su intención de llevarle a la comisaría acusado de hacer sonar el timbre y luego echar a correr.

Con toda dignidad el *Vicario* le explicó lo ocurrido. El inquilino examinó el buzón y encontró la nota. El *Vicario* se alejó enderezándose el cuello y dando a entender que de no haber sido *un hombre de la Iglesia* le hubieran denunciado por asalto. (p.104)

In the proofs, the three occurrences of the word 'Vicario' have been replaced with the word 'médico', 'feligrés' in the fourth line has been changed to 'cliente', and 'un hombre de la Iglesia' in the last line has been modified to 'el facultativo del lugar'. Consultation of the published text confirms that these modifications were in fact carried out. Once again these substitutions demonstrate that if authority had to be mocked in a children's narrative, a civil authority was considered more acceptable than a religious one, at least in the earlier Francoist period.<sup>3</sup>

Further instances of religious censorship of a similar type are to be found in *Guillermo el malo* (no.10, 1959). In Chapter 7, 'Guillermo y los acampados', William casts himself in the role of missionary, and lectures a gathering of children on the best type of sermon for converting pagans on the Asian continent. A direct reference to William as 'el misionero' has been deleted in the proofs (p.143). The word 'sermón' has also been altered (to 'palabras') or deleted, so that the idea of William preaching an actual sermon is removed (pp.143-44).

Later in the same work, a minor character named Sebastian Buttermere is described as pacing up and down his room 'vestido con algo *semejante al hábito de un fraile medieval*' (p.163). This is because he is an aspiring writer and 'una biografía de Balzac le había enterado de que el famoso escritor francés escribía arropado en *un hábito de monje*' (p.163). In the first sentence, the italicized words have been replaced by the phrase 'parecido a la túnica con capucha de un personaje medieval'. The second highlighted phrase has been changed to 'una túnica'. Numerous other allusions to the 'hábito' on subsequent pages have accordingly been modified to 'túnica'.

Subsequent translations of the *William* books demonstrate that the publishers did not take the trouble to modify allusions to the Protestant vicar after *Guillermo el pirata*, even if these allusions made the vicar appear somewhat ridiculous, or even manifestly unsympathetic. In *Guillermo y el animal del espacio* (no.12), for example,



the following phrase was not suppressed or modified: 'No apareció ninguna visión muy agradable, solamente el señor Monks, el señor Vicario.'

In *Guillermo el gángster* (no.16), the vicar makes a speech at a local 'League of Nations' meeting, in which he praises the charity and benevolence of the local children, whilst the latter are conducting a battle immediately outside the building, in full view of the vicar's audience. This passage was not modified, although the substitution of a civil dignitary would have been simple to carry out.

This latter example merely constitutes gentle ridicule of the vicar's benevolent unworldliness. In the case of *Guillermo buscador de tesoros* (no.28), on the other hand, the vicar is shown in a decidedly more unfavourable light. William asks the vicar if he can employ Aaron, a sympathetic elderly character whom the protagonist has befriended, as an organist. The vicar slams the door in his face. This episode is unmodified in the proofs, and the two censors of the work made no mention of it in their reports, which were positive, suggesting the extent to which the subversive spirit of the *William* books was accepted by the censors of the mid-1960s.

The censorship history of *Tom Sawyer* contains relatively few instances of objections to portrayals of, specifically, ministers of the Church, whether mocking or otherwise. Nevertheless, the censor of FHER's 1960 edition (no.23) pointed out that 'el traductor ha debido "convertir" los protestantes a católicos y así tan pronto sale "la misa mayor" como el "pastor"'. Here it seems the censor is objecting more to the confusion of terminology, and perhaps consequent doctrinal transgressions, than the mere mention, mocking or otherwise, of a Protestant clergyman per se.

Less equivocally, the censor of Juventud's 1966 edition (no.31) cited in his list of objections '[un] grabado que ridiculiza al pastor protestante'. The illustration in question shows a cartoon-like image of a clergyman weeping improbably large tears, his head bowed in sorrow (proofs, p.121). The sense of ridicule perceived by the censor arises from the fact that the priest is mourning the 'death' of Tom, Huck and Joe, who have allowed the populace to believe they have drowned, in order to savour the pleasure of attending their own funerals. It will be recalled that no objection was made to this illustration, or indeed to any other feature, when Juventud submitted the same edition in 1957 (no.18). As with much of the evidence regarding *Tom Sawyer*, therefore, the objection to this illustration in 1966 tends to demonstrate that the work's

difficulties with the censors only arose when it was considered as a work specially intended for children.

This point is further illustrated by the report on Sopena's 1967 edition (no.35), in which one of the censor's objections was to an instance of 'irrespetuosidad hacia la jerarquía eclesiástica'. The passage in question has Tom enthusing about Robin Hood to Joe, who asks: '¿Y a quién robaba?'. Tom replies: 'Únicamente a los *sheriffs*, obispos, reyes, ricachos y gente por el estilo. Nunca se metía con los pobres, y siempre iba a partes iguales con ellos, repartiendo hasta el último centavo' (p.190; italicized as in original proofs).

Various points are illustrated by the censor's objection to this passage. Firstly, the primacy of religious authority as a censorship consideration is confirmed by the censor's specification that it is disrespect towards ecclesiastical hierarchy which motivates his objection, despite the fact that other, civil sources of power are equally maligned in Tom's account of the outlaw's activities. Secondly, the fact that the censor considered the allusion disrespectful at all suggests a certain, limited sensitivity to considerations of context and point of view. The fact that bishops, or anyone else, should be robbed by a criminal does not in itself reflect badly on the victims. It is only Tom's approval of the crime and its perpetrator which can explain the censor's indignant response.

The only other easily verifiable example of official objection to the Robin Hood episode on the part of Franco's censors occurred in the case of Nausica's 1943 edition (no.3). In this case, the censor's disapproval of the work as a whole was ostensibly motivated by its foreign ethos ('obra de ambiente muy norteamericano'), his only specifically identified objection being to the work's exaltation of a criminal lifestyle. The majority of the censor's actual suppressions thus naturally concern allusions to criminality in *Tom Sawyer*, a subject discussed in Chapter 7 of the present dissertation. Other passages marked for suppression in the proofs belong to other categories of prohibition, however. In the case of the Robin Hood episode, the passage marked for suppression reads as follows:

-Es uno de los hombres más grandes que han existido en Inglaterra, y el mejor. Era un ladrón.  
-¡Córcholis! Me gustaría serlo. ¿A quién robaba?

-Sólo a los sheriffs y obispos, y a los ricos y a los reyes y gente por el estilo. Pero nunca molestaba a los pobres. Los quería. Siempre repartía el botín con ellos equitativamente. (p.118)

Since the censor did not place any of his recommended suppressions into specific categories of prohibition, as was the practice in later reports, it is impossible to be sure of precisely which feature provoked the excision of this particular passage. Possible causes might be: exaltation of theft; implicit disrespect towards figures in authority generally; implicit disrespect towards bishops particularly; implicit advocacy of communistic redistribution of wealth. Though the last possibility may seem implausible, orthodox paranoia concerning left-wing ideology, particularly in this early era, can hardly be overstated.<sup>4</sup> It seems likely that all of these factors, at some level, influenced the censor's decision to suppress this passage.

Other evidence suggests that in fact the last of the possible causes for the passage's suppression was probably a less important factor than the others, at least in the later Francoist period. Bruguera's 1960 edition (no.24) includes the Robin Hood passage, but Tom's description of the outlaw's activities reads as follows: 'No te asustes, sólo robaba a los ricos. Pero nunca molestaba a los pobres. Por el contrario, cuando robaba algo, y eso sucedía con frecuencia, se lo regalaba a ellos'. Here the preemptive censorship carried out by the translator or editor shows that it was the attack on authority generally which was felt to be a possible cause for official objection.<sup>5</sup> The arguably communistic overtones of the passage remain intact in this modified version, suggesting that the editor felt this interpretation too tenuous to be a possible problem with the censor.<sup>6</sup>

Thus whilst the censor of Sopena's 1967 edition objected explicitly to Tom's approval of bishops being robbed, the preemptive censorship of the Bruguera edition suggests that attacks on figures of authority generally were considered a possible motive for official objection. The hierarchy of proscribable allusions this suggests, according to which disrespect towards civil authority is bad, but disparagement of religious authority is worse, is borne out by the substitutions effected in the early *William* translations, described above.

It is worth reiterating that official suppression of this passage in *Tom Sawyer* again obeys the law that it only occurs in editions specifically regarded as destined for children by the censors (though not in all such editions). It will be recalled that the

report on the Nausica edition of 1943 is the only one from the early period in which the censor explicitly attributes his suppressions to the fact that the work is intended for children ('teniendo en cuenta que la obra está escrita para que la lean los muchachos'). Other earlier editions of the work include the passage without modification. An example is Aguilar's 1948 edition (no.9), reproduced in the *Novelas completas y ensayos* in 1952 (no.13). Aguilar used the version of *Tom Sawyer* by María Alfaro, precisely the same version submitted by Sopena in 1967, in which the Robin Hood passage was deemed disrespectful. This again illustrates the relative harshness of censorship in the area of children's literature, and further demonstrates the far-reaching implications of the inscription of children's literature as a special category.<sup>7</sup>

## (ii) Mockery of religious scripture and ceremony

Thus far, the episodes discussed have involved mockery of, specifically, clergymen of the Protestant Church. Allusions to ceremony and scripture in *Tom Sawyer* and the *William* books prove to be an equally common source of objection on the part of the Francoist censors, and are thus worth discussing as a separate category. *Guillermo el organizador* (no.8), again, contains revealing examples of references to both scripture and ceremony which have been modified, presumably by the editor, in order to render the work acceptable according to National-Catholic orthodoxy. Addressing first references to scripture, the following passage appears in the proofs:

Sobre una silla, junto a su cama, había un libro sobre *Historia de la Iglesia*<sup>a</sup>, regalo de la tía Emilia. [...] Leyó unas cuantas páginas; pero el carácter y los hechos del *Santo Aidán*<sup>b</sup> le exasperó de tal manera, que se vio obligado a desahogarse sacando el lápiz de su estuche y adornando *la estampa del santo*<sup>c</sup> con un sombrero de copa y unas gafas. [...] Hizo parecidas reformas en todas las ilustraciones del libro. [...] *San Osvaldo*<sup>d</sup> pareció ganar mucho con ello, cosa que animó a Guillermo enormemente. (Typed proofs, p.172)

The labelled items have been deleted and replaced, in ink, as follows: a) 'antigua de Roma'; b) 'Emperador Nerón'; c) 'la efigie del Emperador'; d) 'el Emperador Trajano'.

William completes his improvised editing procedures a few pages later:

Tropezó su mirada con *las profanadas estampas de los santos* y, dándose cuenta de pronto de la enormidad del crimen a los ojos de las personas

mayores, sacó la navaja y las cortó. Hizo barquitos de papel con *las estampas* [...]. (p.176)

Here the first highlighted string has been replaced with the words 'los dibujos de las luchas en el circo', and the second with 'los dibujos'.

As with the similar substitutions discussed above, what is revealing here is the fact that the publishers (assuming that they modified the text) considered that it was the specifically religious nature of the book, rather than the sheer fact that a child should be described casually defiling a work of literature, and a gift from an aunt, which was likely to result in censorship difficulties. It should be recalled, however, that the publishers efforts were ultimately in vain: the censor's condemnation of *Guillermo el organizador* as 'irreverente' and 'con espíritu quizás impertinente para España' was never revised, and Molino were refused permission to publish the work on two separate occasions.

The proofs of *Guillermo el organizador* nevertheless reveal that the publishers made still further modifications relating to episodes in which religious scripture, and William's idiosyncratic response to it, have a central role. In the final chapter of the work, entitled 'Guillermo y San Valentín' in the translation, the reader is introduced to 'la señorita Lomas [quien] daba una clase de enseñanza bíblica para hijos e hijas de gente distinguida' (p.254). In the proofs, the word 'bíblica' has been changed to 'religiosa', in ink. This is clearly an attempt to remove a somewhat indirect, but in no way mocking allusion to Protestantism (the central role of the Bible in religious education classes would inevitably presuppose a Protestant milieu).

Forced to attend Miss Lomas's class, William initiates a discussion on the subject of Saint Valentine's day. In response to Miss Lomas's somewhat confused explanation of the institution, the protagonist replies:

-Bueno, pues a mí no *me merece mucho respeto como santo*. [...] *¡Mira que escribir cartas tontas a las muchachas en vez de hacerse martirizar como es debido, como Pedro y los demás...!* (pp.256-57)

The first italicized phrase has been deleted and replaced with the words 'yo no acabo de comprender la vida de ese', and the second highlighted section has simply been scored out in ink.

Later in the chapter, William returns to the same subject in conversation with his mother:

-¿Qué quiere decir la gente cuando dice que va a mandar una 'valentina', mamá?- preguntó Guillermo aquella noche. -Yo creí que era una especie de santo. No veo yo cómo puede mandársele un santo a nadie, *sobre todo cuando está muerto y en el libro de misa.* (p.264)

The highlighted phrase has been scored out in ink. Still failing to grasp the concept, William complains a little later: 'No veo el sentido común de mandar helechos pegados y santos muertos y cosas así' (p.264). The word 'muertos' has been crossed through.

Finally, William gives a valentine to his constant admirer Joan, who asks him to explain the institution. Confusing the various explanations he has been given in the course of the episode, William replies:

-Algunos dicen que era un santo *que les escribía cartas sentimentales a las chicas en lugar de hacerse martirizar como es debido, como Pedro y como los otros*, y otros dicen que es un poco de helecho como éste; y otros dicen que es una caja de bombones. (p.271)

The italicized words have been deleted in ink. Clearly, then, the editor felt that repeated allusions to the immortal saints as 'dead' was likely to be considered misleading by the censor. The notion that a saint might have spent his days writing love-letters to women is felt objectionable for obvious reasons, as is William's somewhat flippant allusion to martyrdom. Here the literal-mindedness of the censorship apparatus, its almost wilful blindness to irony, is exemplified. It is quite obvious from the rest of the chapter that William's description of the saint is a confused conflation of several earlier explanations he has been offered. Nevertheless, the sheer impact of descriptions such as those offered by William, expressed in print in a children's book, was clearly felt to be too much for the censor to absorb, whatever the mitigating contextual circumstances. The excision of William's offhand allusion to martyrdom suggests that such holy matters had to be spoken of in an appropriately reverential tone if they were to be included in a children's work at all, at least in the early period. Since the comic impact of William's remark derives precisely from his casual treatment of a supposedly sacred matter, the incompatibility between a strictly pious censorship and ironical humour is clearly demonstrated.

The proofs of *Guillermo el organizador* also provide a convenient introduction to the censorship of episodes involving religious ceremony (as opposed to ministers or scripture) in the *William* books and *Tom Sawyer*. Again, it must be stressed that the

evidence of *Guillermo el organizador* can only be an indirect reflection of National-Catholic taboos in this area, since it consists of modifications which can be assumed to be an ultimately futile attempt at preemptive censorship on the part of the editor. The relevant passages come from Chapter 9 of the translation, entitled 'Guillermo dice la verdad', the same chapter discussed above, in which William vandalizes a religious text. These passages read as follows:

Guillermo iba a la iglesia, con su familia, todos los domingos por la mañana, *pero no acostumbraba escuchar el sermón. Lo consideraba una pérdida de tiempo. A veces le gustaba cantar los salmos y los himnos.* [...] Durante el sermón, Guillermo miraba fijamente al pastor protestante (Guillermo siempre vencía en esta clase de juego porque el pastor empezaba a sentir, invariablemente, embarazo a los cinco minutos de aguantar la mirada del niño), o celebraba un concurso de muecas con el pelirrojo que cantaba en el coro, *o se distraía con insectos que llevaba a la iglesia en una caja de cerillas*, hasta que ponían freno a sus actividades las miradas combinadas de su padre, su madre, Ethel y Roberto.

[...] Pero aquel domingo, atraído por el frecuente sonido de la palabra 'Navidad', Guillermo *se guardó el escarabajo en la caja de cerillas y dedicó toda su atención a la plática.*

[...] *Guillermo hubo de retirar su atención a la plática al descubrir que no había cerrado del todo la caja de cerillas y que el escarabajo estaba subiendo por el gabán de Ethel. Afortunadamente, ésta estaba demasiado ocupada fijándose en todos los detalles del nuevo vestido de Marion Hatherly, que estaba al otro lado de la iglesia, que no se dio cuenta de lo ocurrido. Guillermo volvió a capturar el escarabajo y lo metió en la caja luego.* (pp.167-68)

Firstly, it is interesting that the author of these suppressions felt that it was acceptable to retain the allusions to William's face-pulling competitions with a member of the choir and, particularly, his stare-down with the curate. The latter allusion appears particularly subversive, since the curate seems to be a willing participant in the contest. The fact that William is described as always winning these battles of nerve also has the effect of suggesting the child's greater strength of will. This is consistent with the portrayal of ecclesiastical figures as benignly ineffectual figures elsewhere in the *William* books, but it hardly accords with the National-Catholic approach to religious authority.

It is conceivable that this less than reverential allusion to the vicar was thought acceptable by the author of the suppressions as long as the specific designation 'el pastor protestante' was used. The fact that the translator repeatedly, though not always,

used this rather cumbersome designation may suggest that the publishers hoped to render such allusions acceptable to the censor by using it.<sup>8</sup> It will be recalled that there is no evidence for such a subtle appreciation of point of view in the report by the official censor, however, in which the mere fact of the clergymen in the work being Protestant at all is cited as a negative characteristic.

The excision of the episode involving William's pet insect suggests that whilst the protagonist's (and indeed his older sister's) lack of attention to a Protestant service was not considered unacceptable in itself, the notion of a child profaning a church, of whatever denomination, in such a manner was felt to transgress acceptable limits.

This particular episode has close parallels, both elsewhere in the *William* books and in *Tom Sawyer*, and is thus of particular use in detecting how censorship practice altered according to the particular text being censored, the specific context of a given allusion, and the prevailing conditions in the Ministry overall. We can infer, for example, that childish mischief of this sort was thought particularly unexemplary if it took place in church, even a Protestant church, since the editor chose not to suppress passages describing the escape or willful release of the beetle during classes at school. The first of these episodes occurs in Miss Lomas's 'religion' class (proofs, p.257), and like the church episode thus describes William paying no attention to a Protestant religious event of some sort. This suggests that it is specifically the fact that William is in church which motivated the suppression of the first passage involving the beetle. This theory is supported by the fact that the beetle actually causes disruption in the unsuppressed episode in the classroom, but goes unnoticed in the suppressed episode in church.

Another revealingly similar episode, recounted at somewhat greater length than the incidents involving the beetle, occurs in *Travesuras de Guillermo* (no.33). The episode describes William's attempts to train a newly acquired pet rat to dance during the Sunday service. The scandal caused by the rat is naturally greater than in the case of the beetle, whose presence in church, as we have noted, had not been noticed by anyone except William. It is therefore interesting to note that although the rat episode is considerably more scurrilous than the beetle episode, only one of the two censors objected to the former specifically, and his actual suppressions in the text were fairly meagre.



The first suppression in fact occurs before the rat has been smuggled into the church. William is summoned to the Sunday service, just as he is beginning to achieve some success in his attempts to train his new rats:

-¡Guillermo! ¡Es hora de ir a la iglesia!

Guillermo soltó un gemido al oír lo que le decían. *Aquello era lo peor de los domingos, pero peor aquel día.* (p.171)

In the following condensation of the rat incident itself, the unsuppressed sections are included to demonstrate the remarkably selective nature of the censor's excisions:

[Guillermo] se dirigió a la iglesia en silencio, caminando detrás de su familia, agarrando con una mano su libro de oraciones y, con la otra, metida en el bolsillo, sujetando a 'Rufina'. Esperaba poder continuar su amaestramiento durante la letanía.

No quedó decepcionado. Ethel estaba a un lado suyo y no había nadie al otro. Se arrodilló con devoción, escudándose la cara con una mano y sujetando firmemente con la otra las patas delanteras de 'Rufina', mientras la obligaba a caminar por el suelo. Fue absorbiéndose más y más en su tarea...

[...] La letanía acabó mucho más aprisa de lo que recordaba que hubiese pasado en otras ocasiones. El niño volvió a guardarse la rata en el bolsillo cuando se pusieron en pie para cantar el himno de rigor. Y fue durante ese himno cuando ocurrió la catástrofe.

Los Brown ocupaban el asiento delantero de la iglesia. Cuando se estaba cantando la segunda estrofa, los feligreses quedaron asombrados al ver un animalito pequeño, blanco, de rabo muy largo, aparecer de pronto sobre el hombro del señor Brown.

El chillido de Ethel casi ahogó el sonido del órgano. El señor Brown alzó la mano para quitarse el intruso y éste le saltó encima de la cabeza y permaneció allí unos instantes, clavando las uñas en el cuero cabelludo de su víctima.

El señor Brown miró a su hijo con rostro congestionado que prometía futura venganza.

Los feligreses en pleno dirigieron como fascinados su mirada hacia la rata y el himno se extinguió. El rostro de Guillermo expresaba el más profundo horror.

*'Rufina' apareció a continuación, corriendo por el borde del púlpito. Como consecuencia, la mayoría del elemento femenino salió de la iglesia sin andarse con cumplidos. Hasta el clérigo palideció al acercarse 'Rufina' y subírsele al atril.*

Finalmente, uno de los niños del coro le echó mano en seguida y se retiró a la sacristía, desde donde se fue a su casa antes de que le preguntaran con qué derecho guardaba la rata. (pp.172-73)

The final suppression concerning this episode refers to a remark made by William a little after the church visit. On arriving home, William discovers that his

other newly acquired rat, Cromwell, has been killed by his dog, Jumble. Though naturally a little upset at first, William brightens at the thought of an opportunity for a funeral ceremony: '-Tendremos que enterrarla- agregó animándose visiblemente-. *Leeré los funerales verdaderos en el libro de misa*'.

The first and last suppressions relating to this episode are relatively uncontroversial, since they are direct expressions of unequivocally irreverent notions, namely William's dislike of church-going, and solemn Christian rites being employed at the funeral of a rat, respectively.<sup>9</sup> The fact that only the climactic scenes of maximum chaos were marked for suppression in the account of the incident in the church itself, however, seems to represent a considerable degree of tolerance in the light of the wholesale, preemptive suppression of the much less irreverent beetle incident. This impression is confirmed by the fact that the climactic three sentences from the scene in the church were not in fact suppressed or modified at all in the final published version, probably indicating that Molino had persuaded the censors to allow their inclusion.<sup>10</sup>

This may suggest that the preemptive censor of *Guillermo el organizador* was being excessively cautious. It is more likely to reflect, however, the accumulated good favour and popularity which the series had come to enjoy by the late 1960s, and the extremely slow but perceptible overall liberalization which had taken place since the 1940s. The relative restraint exercised by the censor of *Travesuras de Guillermo* is particularly noteworthy since this work was only the second of the *William* books to be assessed under the new *Estatuto de Publicaciones Infantiles*, which definitively established children's literature as a unique category requiring additional censorship rigour (see pp.97-100, above). The turbulent political atmosphere of the era, it will be recalled, also provoked a general increase of censorship zeal: the work was submitted just six months after the historic events of May 1968, amidst ominous rumblings of popular discontent in Spain (p.31, above). One of the censor's reports for this work did in fact reflect a reemergent hostility towards the series generally, but the censor nevertheless did not feel justified in suggesting the work be suppressed outright.

Whilst the increased hostility shown to *Tom Sawyer* in this period suggests that the reactionary backlash which occurred towards the end of Fraga's mandate did have some effect on children's literature, the complicating factor of *Tom Sawyer's*

depreciation of status from adult to children's work, at a somewhat earlier date, precludes the kind of direct comparison of episodes required to determine the precise extent of this effect. The respective levels of censorship imposed on the parallel episodes from *Guillermo el organizador* and *Travesuras de Guillermo*, however, suggest that actual censorship practice in the area of children's literature during the late-1960s reactionary backlash did not regress to the stringent levels of the 1940s.

Further research involving comparison of a number of different texts would be required to substantiate this claim entirely, however. Despite the fact that *William* briefly fell into disfavour with the publication of *Travesuras de Guillermo*, the pressure of the series' accumulated prestige over the previous decade may have determined that suppression of the rat episode was viewed as less justifiable than expurgation of the earlier beetle episode, which was suppressed when *William* had no 'pedigree' and was entering a period of general persecution.

Other important aspects of the censorship of children's literature can be explored by referring to a passage which can be regarded as the direct literary forbear of Crompton's episodes using the scenario of pets in church. The passage occurs in Chapter 5 of *Tom Sawyer*, in which Twain memorably evokes the Sunday service in the town of St. Petersburg. In the English text, it is made quite clear that Tom, and indeed most of the townsfolk, regard the ceremony as a tedious duty. Tom produces a recently captured beetle from his pocket in an attempt to alleviate the boredom of this ritual, and the creature promptly escapes. A nearby poodle then initiates a drawn-out duel with the creature, which culminates in the dog inadvertently sitting on the beetle. The hapless victim careers noisily around the church, 'till presently he was but a woolly comet moving in its orbit with the gleam and the speed of light' (p.31).

It is made clear that these events come as a welcome relief to the bored congregation. The only party who is not delighted by the incident, aside from the dog, is the parson, whose attempts at solemnity thereafter 'were constantly being received with a smothered burst of unholy mirth, under cover of some remote pew-back' (p.32). Tom's conclusion at the end of the chapter is that 'there was some satisfaction about divine service when there was a bit of variety in it'.

Clearly, there is much in this episode which might be expected to have attracted the censor's disapproval. The scandal caused by the incident is not quite

equal in scale to the furore provoked by William's rat, which prompted the flight of half the congregation. The implications of the passage in *Tom Sawyer* are somewhat more subversive, however, for whilst William's rat causes universal consternation, in the episode involving Tom's beetle and the dog it is only the parson who is genuinely scandalized, whilst the rest of the assembled gathering can barely disguise their delight at a welcome injection of farce into a stifflingly solemn weekly ritual. There is thus no suggestion that Tom will be made to pay a price for the mischief he has caused, whilst it is made clear that dire consequences await William for his folly.

Given its considerable degree of subversive content, it is noteworthy that no censor cited this passage as specifically objectionable until FHER's 1960 edition (no.23), despite the fact that the episode was frequently included in earlier editions (nos.1, 3, 6, 9, 10, 13, 19). Thereafter, it was a fairly common source of objection, being cited by the censors of numbers 31, 33, 34 and 35.

The censors did not always object specifically to this episode in the later period, however, even in reports which were generally negative. Thus in his resoundingly negative report on Ferma's 1963 adaptation of the work (no.27), the censor mentions 'los pasajes macabros (desenterrar los cadáveres con vistas a venderlos)' and 'escenas de crímenes y falsedades en la persona de Joe', but not the incident involving the beetle, which is included in Chapter 2 of the adaptation. This may suggest implicit approval of the scene because the target of the satire is Protestant, or it may reflect the priorities of this particular censor.

The latter explanation is the more plausible, since as we have seen above, the evidence generally suggests that the specific targeting of Protestantism did not excuse the subversion of religion in *Tom Sawyer*. Though the censors' approach to the question of Protestantism remained constant, however, their way of alluding to it in reports evolved in a revealing manner. Before FHER's 1960 edition, in the two instances of objections to religious episodes in *Tom Sawyer* and the *William* books, the censors cited the mere fact that references to Protestant clergy or practices were included in the works (Appendix A, no.8; Appendix B, no.20). In the case of FHER's edition (no.23), and in subsequent reports in which the episode is specifically mentioned, it is the *mockery* of a religious ceremony which the censor emphasizes. Thus the censor of FHER's 1960 edition cites the 'pasaje en que un perro juega con

un escarabajo, algo irreverente'. The censors of Juventud's 1966 edition (no.31) and Sopena's 1967 edition (no.35) specifically point up the element of mockery in the episode, alluding to '[una] descripción burlesca de un oficio religioso protestante' and '[una] chacota sobre un oficio religioso' respectively.

It seems likely that the later censors were being more honest than the earlier ones, for the evidence of the *William* books suggests that it was the subversion of religious authority which was at the root of objections to episodes involving priests. The preemptive censorship of the beetle episode in *Guillermo el organizador* clearly indicates that the early censors were expected to disapprove of such irreverence, despite the explicitly Protestant target. They seem remarkably coy about saying so, however. Thus the censor of *Guillermo el organizador* refers to the 'espíritu quizás impertinente para España' of the work, which he also calls 'irreverente', and he also mentions the presence of Protestant clergy in the work, but he does not link the two elements in the way that the later censors do. Somewhat similarly, the censor of Ferma's 1957 edition of *Tom Sawyer* rejects the work, alluding to its protagonist as 'travieso y a veces muy alocado', but merely mentioning 'alusiones a las prácticas religiosas protestantes'.

It thus appears that there was some confusion in the minds of the early censors with regard to the question of point of view. Mockery of authority was considered worthy of condemnation, as was Protestantism, but when the two were combined they did not cancel each other out as one might logically expect, but were instead illogically viewed as separate, negative characteristics. This rather confused approach is further exemplified by Padre Garmendia de Otaola's description of *Tom Sawyer* in his *Libros buenos y malos a la luz del dogma y de la moral*, a children's literature bibliography whose entries are strongly reminiscent of official censorship reports: 'No es conveniente para niños, por el criterio del autor, que es protestante y que ridiculiza cuanto puede su religión y los ministros de ella' (Garmendia de Otaola, p.430). This is surely the Catholic priest trying to have his cake and eat it by censoring both Protestantism and Twain's habit of ridiculing it.

In later years, mockery of religious authority is explicitly, and more honestly, cited as the reason for objection to irreverent incidents: no censor after 1957 objected to the mere presence of Protestant elements in either the *William* books or *Tom*

*Sawyer*.<sup>11</sup> It will be recalled that this shift is reflected in the differences of wording and emphasis in the religious sections of the 1956 *Reglamento* and the 1967 *Estatuto* (p.98, above). The earlier law established that 'tendentious' allusions to non-Catholic confessions would be suppressed (Item 2d). The clear implication was that 'tendentious' meant tending to assert the truth of rival doctrines. As far as mockery of religion was concerned, it specifically established that only the Catholic Church could not be the object of ridicule (Item 1b). During the earlier period, the censors could only object to passages, or entire works, on the basis that they merely included Protestant clergy or rituals at all, since technically they could not object to mockery of non-Catholic confessions. The relevant section of the 1967 law, which established that mockery of any religion was proscribable (Section 9(c)), amounted to a frank admission that what the regime principally wished to suppress was any portrayal of subversion of religious authority.

The censors' approach to this question suggests that they felt that considerations of point of view were too sophisticated for the child to appreciate. The child, the censors may have reasoned, will overlook the fact that it is an abhorred rival confession which is being lampooned; they will merely see a scene whose comic effect derives from a child protagonist's disruption of a solemn Christian ceremony. In the case of the beetle incident in *Tom Sawyer*, the child would observe that the adults present in the scene implicitly condoned the disruption by deriving pleasure from it. The fact that the censors seemed more willing, in later years, to acknowledge that it was portrayals of subversion which most concerned them, rather than representations of Protestantism, reflects the steady movement of the regime away from its totalitarian beginnings, when it at least ostensibly defended a substantive ideology, towards a more openly authoritarian polity, which determined that the mere suppression of dissent or subversion was the principal goal.

There is evidence that the question of allusions to Protestantism was dealt with differently by the censors in the case of adult literature. Jacqueline Hurlley describes the response of the censors to religious references in works published by José Janés as follows:

Es ilustrativa la sustitución llevada a cabo en la novela de Rosamond Lehmann, publicada en enero de 1946 con el título de *La balada y la fuente*, no sé si por el traductor o a instancias de la Vicesecretaría de Educación

Popular, ya que no he visto el expediente de esta obra. En una carta, la protagonista, Sibyl Jardine, alude a la detestación de su marido hacia los católicos: 'Harry, with his detestation of RCs...'. En la versión traducida se ha transferido dicha detestación a 'los servicios' de los católicos, salvaguardando así los católicos del furor de Harry. Puestos a modificar, uno se pregunta por qué no se suprimió del todo, ya que el aborrecimiento en cuestión no es esencial a la novela. Evidentemente, la labor de los censores se enfocaba en cuidar la imagen del catolicismo y sus ministros. Es probable que uno de los fundamentos de la oposición a *El Viaje* de Morgan haya sido el hecho de que Thérèse Despreux, la protagonista de reputación dudosa, sea hija del sacerdote católico del pueblo. Por contraste, se toleraron los pecadillos e, incluso, el adulterio, del clero protestante, como ponen en manifiesto en 1946, el mismo año de la denegación de reimpresión de *El Viaje*, *La balada y la fuente* de Rosamond Lehmann y *Paisaje del Sur* de Winifred Holtby. El 'clérigo de cierta clase' de *La balada y la fuente* es una personalidad siniestra y el predicador laico de la iglesia 'Wesleyan Methodist', el concejal Alfred Ezekiel Huggins, visto con suave ironía por Winifred Holtby, como indica el apellido asignado y cuyo detalle se pierde en la traducción, es altamente escandaloso.

(p.191)

It seems, therefore, that the censors attributed sufficient awareness of point of view to adult readers to allow negative representations of Protestant clerics to be included in published works (at least in non-populist editions). It should also be noted in passing that the absolute nature of the taboo against negative allusions to Catholicism is also confirmed by Hurlty's evidence.

A comparison of the reports on two derivative publications which include the character of Tom Sawyer as protagonist, alluded to above (pp.130, 162), also provides telling evidence that the censors responded differently to representations of Protestantism, according to whether they considered a work as belonging to the category of children's literature or not.

The censor of *Tom Sawyer detective y otras dos narraciones*, submitted by Nausica in 1943 (Appendix C, no.2), classified the work as 'literario' rather than 'infantil'. He reported that: 'el tercer cuento ridiculiza, sin maldad, a la secta protestante presbiteriana y al puritanismo norteamericano. Me parece en todo publicable.' Despite this apparent tolerance of Tom's mischievous approach to religious authority, the censor indicated that a phrase should be suppressed in the second story, *El legado de 30.000 dólares*: 'Mas poco después, la deslumbró la gran pompa de sus ceremonias, y acabó haciéndose católica por esta razón'. This remark is surely made in the same gently satirical tone which Twain often uses, and which he undoubtedly

employed in his allusions to Protestantism in this work, which the censor decided were entirely harmless. That he chose to suppress this flippant but hardly scandalous jibe at Catholicism reveals that the censor's apparent tolerance towards gentle mockery of religious authority is disingenuous: the fact that he did not suppress such mockery of Protestantism, but did so in the case of Catholicism, leads to the inevitable conclusion that the abhorrence of Protestantism, as Hurlley suspects, made it a legitimate target for satire in adult literature published in Spain, and that this consideration outweighed the orthodox reluctance to allow attacks on authority.

This balance of criteria evidently tipped the other way in the case of children's literature. This is decisively confirmed by the report on Sopena's 1967 volume *Tom Sawyer detective y Tom Sawyer en el extranjero* (Appendix C, no.7), in which the censor stipulated that two suppressions had to be carried out, 'para publicar como obra juvenil'. One of these suppressions was labelled by the censor as 'mordacidad respecto a un pastor protestante'.

There are two possible interpretations of this reversal in the balance of criteria: either the censors did not approve of mockery of religious authority of any type, but tolerated it in adult literature if the target was not Catholicism; or the censors approved of implicitly derisive allusions to non-Catholic denominations, but felt that Spanish children were insufficiently aware of the relative nature of religious worship to appreciate the indirectly positive character of such allusions. In practice, the censors' views on this matter probably altered according to the precise nature of the allusion and the context in which it appeared. Whatever the precise motive, the fact that mockery of Protestantism was frequently suppressed in books for children and not in books for adults suggests the importance placed on the inculcation of conformism through the censorship of subversion in children's literature: the censors were willing to forego opportunities to condemn Protestantism in an implicit fashion, in order to be sure that no child arrived at the conclusion that taking a rat to church might be an amusing idea.



(iii) Other religious allusions

From Juventud's 1966 edition onwards (no.31), many reports contain objections to the scene in which Injun Joe, Muff Potter and Dr. Robinson desecrate a grave (nos.34, 35, 37, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 51). Since this episode portrays open contempt for the institution of Christian burial, and no peculiarly Protestant elements are present, the censor's objection to it in a work for children is uncontroversial. Once again, however, the censor's assumption that children are incapable of appreciating considerations of point of view is revealed. It is quite clear that the reader is not invited to approve of the activities of the criminals, whose ringleader is the character unequivocally presented as the villain of the novel, Injun Joe. Tom and Huck, through whose eyes the reader observes the events in question, are appalled by what they see, and it haunts them thereafter. Unlike other allusions to criminal activity in *Tom Sawyer*, therefore, it is clear that the very real desecration of the tomb and the murder of Dr. Robinson could not be construed as encouraging imitative behaviour in the child reader. The suppression of episodes portraying unorthodox activities, even if such activities tended to be condemned by the narrative context, can be viewed as a practical consequence of the Francoist doctrine of the innocence of the child. The mere notion that activities such as graverobbing should take place at all, whether implicitly condemned or not by the surrounding narrative, was perhaps felt to be too shocking for the 'spiritual' Spanish child to assimilate.

One might also argue that the sheer macabre detail of this episode was considered inappropriate in a children's book. This was ostensibly the view of the censor of Ferma's 1963 edition (no.27), who cited the grave-robbing passage as an example of 'pasajes macabros' in the work. The regime's highly selective approach to violence and macabre detail in children's literature generally (discussed in Chapter 7), however, suggests that the suppression of this episode was particularly motivated by the fact that the activities described are not only criminal and macabre, but also sacrilegious. This theory is supported by the fact that the censors of the Juventud and Sopena editions (nos.31, 35) merely alluded to 'profanación de una tumba' in their reports. Needless to say, this episode is included in full in various editions of *Tom Sawyer* published before the inscription of children's literature as a separate category requiring additional censorship rigour (nos.1, 3, 6, 9, 10, 13).

The censors of the 1967 Sopena edition (no.35) and the SRD edition of the same year (no.37) also objected to what they respectively described as '[una] idea negativa sobre el matrimonio' and '[una] idea detractora del matrimonio' in *Tom Sawyer*. The passage in question relates a conversation between Tom and Huck about how they are to spend their share of the treasure they have come upon:

- Y tú, Tom, ¿qué vas a hacer con lo que te corresponde?
- Comprarme otro tambor, una espada de verdad, una corbata colorada, y luego me casaría.
- ¿Te casarías?
- Naturalmente.
- A ti te falta un tornillo.
- Aguarda un poco y verás...
- Eso es lo peor que puedes hacer, Tom. Fíjate en papá y mamá. Toda mi vida los he visto pegándose.
- ¡Vaya una cosa! Mi novia no es de esas.
- Yo creo que todas son iguales; todas nos tratan a patadas. Más vale que lo pienses bien. ¿Cómo se llama la chica?
- No se trata de una chica; es una niña.
- Da lo mismo. Unos dicen chica y otros niña; pero la cuestión es saber cómo se llama.
- Ya te lo diré algún día; ahora no puedo.
- Bueno, déjalo. Ahora que si te casas, me voy a quedar más solo que nunca. (no.35, pp.184-85)

Once again, the censor's literal-mindedness, or the literal-mindedness he attributes to potential child readers, is revealed by his objection to this subtly pathetic passage. Firstly, it is extremely doubtful that the passage as a whole can justifiably be said to condemn marriage. The hero of the novel, Tom, expresses a firm desire to marry, a step he regards as entirely natural. It is only Huck, the misfit of the story, who views marriage negatively. It is clear that Huck's view is based on his wholly untypical experience as the product of a broken home. It is also evident that he is repeating sentiments expressed by his father, described elsewhere as 'the town drunkard' (*Tom Sawyer*, p.35). This is clear from the fact that he attributes the strife of marriage to the tyranny of women ('todas nos tratan a patadas'), though his drunken father must surely be equally responsible for the Finn family's difficulties.

Most importantly of all, the censor ignores the fact that Huck's tragic motivation for attempting to dissuade Tom from marrying is very clearly revealed: 'Si te casas, me voy a quedar más solo que nunca' ('only if you get married I'll be more lonelier than ever' (*Tom Sawyer*, p.126)). The acute pathos of this simple admission

of motive surely has the overall effect of bringing home the tragic consequences for children of broken marriages, and therefore of asserting the importance of a stable family background for the child's emotional wellbeing.

Finally, it is worth recording an unsuppressed remark in *Guillermo artista de cine* (no.24) which reveals the selective application of religious censorship in the area of children's books: 'Guillermo idolatraba a los superhombres, pero nunca tuvo gran opinión de las supermujeres' (p.261). Whilst William's overall sentiment here accords with orthodox notions of male dominance, the first part of the phrase, taken literally, would seem to be clearly blasphemous. It will be recalled that the figure of the superhero, and *Superman* in particular, was the source of numerous censorship difficulties in the Fraga era, and that the censors saw fit to excise phrases such as 'la lluvia es omnipotente' from children's stories (pp.101). The fact that this idolatrous allusion was not suppressed, at a time when both *Tom Sawyer* and *Superman* itself were experiencing censorship difficulties, suggests the extent to which the ironical spirit of the *William* books had come to be accepted as an integral part of the children's literary institution which the series had become. Conversely, the change of status of *Tom Sawyer* from adult to children's work meant that it lost its institutional pedigree and was subjected to new and especially rigorous scrutiny.

## Conclusion

Overall, the evidence discussed above suggests that the censors usually felt that considerations of point of view were too subtle for a child to comprehend. Mockery of Protestant religious figures or ceremony was thus considered generally unacceptable merely because it implicitly condoned the ridicule of religion and of figures in religious authority. The censors only began to acknowledge this fact explicitly in the later period, however.

The evidence of *Tom Sawyer*, and the information supplied by Hurtley, suggests that Protestantism *was* considered a legitimate target for satire in books or editions which the censors considered to be intended for an adult readership. The fact that this was not so in the case of children's literature confirms that the regime applied different, more rigorous censorship criteria to children's books.

The fact that various potentially objectionable religious allusions passed unremarked in later *William* books suggests, however, that considerations of prestige or 'censorship pedigree' also had a bearing on this matter. *William* latterly became 'institutionalized' to some extent, by becoming generally popular and by accumulating a positive censorship record. When editions of *Tom Sawyer* began to be viewed as intended specifically for children, this had the effect of 'deinstitutionalizing' the work, with the result that in the later period it was censored rather more harshly than the *William* books, whose status as a children's book remained unchanged, but whose overall prestige increased. This might explain the intolerance of derisive allusions to Protestantism in later editions of *Tom Sawyer*, and the tolerance of such allusions in later *William* books.

## NOTES:

1. *Lecturas buenas y malas a la luz del dogma y de la moral*, 3rd edn (Bilbao: Mensajero del Corazón de Jesús, 1961), p.xxii.
2. Hereafter, unless otherwise stated all italics used in quotations from the translation proofs are my own and indicate sections of text which have been marked for excision, by crossing out, underlining or ringing in the proofs. Such sections of text are referred to as 'suppressions'. Alternative text which has been added to the proofs to replace the deleted sections is discussed where relevant. Instances in which text has been marked for excision and also replaced by alternative text are referred to as 'modifications'.
3. Interestingly, *Guillermo el bueno* (no.9) contains an instance of editorial modification which suggests that negative allusions to doctors could not exceed certain limits: 'Bien, [Guillermo] siempre había dicho que *los médicos no servían* para nada. Lo decía puesto que no le *dejaban* quedarse en cama cuando se sentía verdaderamente enfermo.' Here 'los médicos' has been changed to 'el médico', 'servían' to 'sirve', and 'dejaban' to 'dejaba'. Clearly, generalized attacks on the medical profession, even from a malingering child, were considered unacceptable.
4. Even in later years, the censors remained on guard for subliminal Communist messages in children's literature. Cisquella, Sorolla and Erviti cite the case of the Editorial Laia's attempt to publish *Las aventuras de bombilla*, refused because the censor 'creía ver una comparación entre Cristo y Lenin' (Cisquella, p.98).
5. In Llovet's significantly modified 1964 edition of *Tom Sawyer* (no.29), Tom's description of Robin Hood is reduced to the following: 'Siempre defendía a los pobres. Los quería mucho' (p.118). In the light of Bruguera's version, this expurgation is clearly unnecessarily radical, but is typical of the Llovet edition.
6. The way the legend of Robin Hood was adapted and censored under Franco is a topic worth investigating in the future, since whilst the outlaw's mission to succour the poor accords with the Francoist promotion of Christian charity, the glamourizing of his criminal status was no doubt thought wholly unexemplary.
7. The censor of the edition submitted by Selecciones de Reader's Digest in 1967 (no.37) in fact made the most unequivocal allusion to mockery of the clergy in the censorship history of *Tom Sawyer*, alluding to 'burla y crítica de la religión y sus ministros' and citing eleven pages containing objectionable passages in this category. Unfortunately, the translation proofs for *Tom Sawyer* are not included in this application (though curiously those of the other two works submitted simultaneously are present). Future consultation of the published edition may establish the identity of the passages in question, though disparities in pagination between the proofs and the final published version often make such collations complicated.
8. It is more likely, however, that the translator used the term 'pastor protestante' to render 'curate', as distinct from Vicar ('vicario' in the translation). In the original, William's staring competitions are with the curate (*Still William* (London and Basingstoke: MacMillan, 1984), p.153). Nevertheless, the specific inclusion of the

word 'protestante' suggests that the translator was at pains to stress that the milieu was not Catholic.

9. The censorship history of *Tom Sawyer* contains several examples of official objection to unorthodox portrayals of funerals. The suppression of an illustration in Juventud's 1966 edition relating to the episode in which Tom, Huck and Joe attend their own 'funerals' has already been discussed above (p.180). The episode itself was also objected to by the censor of Sopena's 1967 edition (Appendix B, no.35), who alluded to the passage as follows: 'Tom y sus amigos asisten a sus propios funerales, con la acostumbrada chanza a propósito de tal situación.' It is clear from the censor's use of the word 'chanza' that it is the irreverent treatment of a solemn religious rite, though performed in a Protestant context, which motivates his objection.

Somewhat similarly, the censor(s) of various editions of Bruguera's version by José María Lladó referred to '[una] apreciación despiadada e irrespetuosa sobre un funeral' (nos.44, 46, 49). Here the censor is referring to Twain's description of the popular response to the funeral of Injun Joe, rendered by Lladó as follows: 'Algunos confesaron que el funeral les había divertido tanto como si hubiesen asistido a la ejecución de Joe' (printed version, p.224). Using the Christian burial rite as an occasion for taking relish in the passing of a fellow man, however base, was clearly felt to transgress Christian notions of forgiveness in a distasteful manner.
10. Pp.154-55. The sentence describing William's distaste for church-going is suppressed outright in the published version (p.153). The phrase 'leeré los funerales verdaderos en el libro de misa' has been modified to 'le haremos un gran entierro' (p.157).
11. The censor of the 1966 Juventud edition (no.31) mentions the specifically Protestant character of Twain's satirical targets, suggesting that even in the later period some censors illogically sought to condemn both Protestantism and subversion of it. In this report also, however, it is clearly the mockery itself which is the principal motive for objection.

## CHAPTER FIVE: LOVE, SEXUALITY and GENDER

Thus sex gradually became an object of great suspicion, [...] the point of weakness where evil portents thrust through to us: a general signification, a universal secret, an omnipresent cause, a fear that never ends. (Michel Foucault)<sup>1</sup>

### Introduction

Item 2(d) of the 1956 *Reglamento* prohibited 'los relatos en que el amor sea tratado con excesivo realismo, sin la indispensable idealidad y delicadeza, y los cuentos que ofrezcan crudeza de expresión o dibujo que puedan calificarse de inmorales'. In principle, therefore, romantic love was not a proscribed subject in children's works, as long as it was treated with sufficient 'delicacy'. The stipulation that love should only be portrayed in an idealized, unrealistic fashion was clearly a somewhat euphemistic way of proscribing physical contact of a romantic or erotic type in children's books. The precise limits of acceptability in representations of love are not elaborated upon further, however: the question of what might constitute 'excesivo realismo' in such a representation is left open.

This item also leaves open the question of whether portrayals of romantic attachment between children, rather than between adults, were permissible in children's literature. The drily pious orthodox prescriptions for children's reading material examined in Chapter 1 would suggest that the regime was averse to such portrayals, but again, there is no specific condemnation of young love in children's literature in these prescriptions. It is therefore not possible to predict from published sources precisely what the regime's response to juvenile romantic contact in children's literature might be. Thus only the censorship histories of works such as *Tom Sawyer* and *William*, which both contain instances of such contact, can reveal the orthodox posture with regard to young love in children's books.

Another question addressed by the analysis below is the extent to which the Francoist gender stereotypes could be transgressed in a children's work. The *William* books are particularly revealing on this matter, since they contain numerous instances of female characters and behaviour which contradict the orthodox stereotype.

The censors' response - or lack of it - to representations of misogyny in the *William* books is also discussed. The patriarchal and ultimately misogynistic character of National-Catholic ideology is reflected in its tolerance of sexist sentiments

expressed by characters in the *William* books, in stark contrast to its intolerance towards expressions of romantic love between the sexes. In the final section of this chapter, the question of adolescent and adult sexuality is also addressed.

(i) Kissing and flirtation

The first instance of a sexual suppression in the censorship histories of *Tom Sawyer* and the *William* books occurs in *Guillermo el organizador* (no.8). William has reluctantly made the acquaintance of the formidable Violet Elizabeth Bott, with whom he has been forced to spend a humiliating afternoon playing 'girl's' games. To his horror, Violet Elizabeth later appears whilst he is with the Outlaws, and is merciless in revealing his acquiescence in the unmanly pursuits of their first meeting:

-No nos gustan las niñas- dijo Pelirrojo, con desprecio.

-A Guillermo zí- exclamó ella con indignación -Dijo que le guztaban. Dijo que le guztaban todaz laz niñaz pequeñaz. Dijo que le hubiera guztado zer niña. *Me bezó y jugó a laz hadaz conmigo.* (p.47)

Violet Elizabeth, it may be recalled, has a lisp, explaining the unconventional spelling of her pronouncements in the translation. As with earlier suppressions in *Guillermo el organizador*, the italicized phrase has been ringed in crayon, and also crossed out in ink in the translation proofs.

Later, Violet Elizabeth tenaciously accompanies the Outlaws on their adventures. The group is captured by gamekeepers, and brought before Mr. Bott, who fails to recognize his daughter, such is her state of dishevelment after an afternoon spent with the Outlaws. It then emerges that the boys can only avoid further negative consequences of their capture if they 'find' Violet Elizabeth, whom the Botts assume to have gone missing. The boys attempt to persuade the girl to allow them to 'capture' her and return her home. Her response is as follows: '-Bueno- asintió Violeta Isabel, alzando la cara; -*zi me bezáiz todoz*, me dejaré encontrar y llevar a caza' (p.58).

The italicized phrase has been ringed and deleted in the usual fashion. The first thing to note about these two suppressions is that they are not at all surprising in the context of Francoist censorship generally, since there is considerable documentary evidence that representations of kisses were excised from literature and film as a matter of course. Two examples of *novelas rosas* in which descriptions of kisses were suppressed have already been cited above (pp.64, 68). Other examples are not difficult



to find: the censor indicated four kissing scenes for suppression in Isabel Irigaray Echevarry's *Quiéreme con locura*, and no less than eleven excisions were imposed on Juan Lozano Rico's *Tu pasión mortal*.<sup>2</sup> In this latter example, from 1968, the censor only marked for suppression certain phrases emphasizing the passionate character of the kiss, or its precise location on the recipient's body (lips, neck, nape of neck etc.); the act of kissing itself is retained in each instance. This tends to confirm Candel and Gironella's postulation of a timid liberalization of censorship in the area of eroticism under Fraga (see p.64, above). It would also tend to support Jacqueline Hurtley's general observation that 'la mano del censor actuó de manera más implacable con la escena erótica directa y hubo cierta actitud tolerante mientras quedaba latente o aludida únicamente' (p.199).

A far more graphic example of the censors' intolerance of representations of kissing is provided by the censorship documentation for *Memoria y Razón de Diego Rivera*, submitted by the Editorial Ancla in 1960.<sup>3</sup> Unsurprisingly, the censors made many objections to this biography of the Mexican artist, some relating to Rivera's espousal of Communism and atheism, others to his sexual fantasies, described in detail and sometimes inspired by religious texts, and others to the artist's views on the *conquistadores* and on the Franco regime itself. One of the censors also marked a seemingly innocuous photograph for suppression, however. The image shows Rivera leaning over his wife Frida Kahlo, who is lying in bed, on the point of kissing her on the lips. The text informs the reader that Kahlo was about to undergo an operation at the time. The fact that the censors felt the need to suppress this entirely moral gesture of support offered in a moment of peril illustrates the revulsion towards portrayals of intimate bodily contact, whatever the circumstances, on the part of the censors.

The erotic significance of the kiss in Spanish society, and reactionary disapproval of its trivialization, is starkly revealed in the following assessment of its role, made by a judge in a court-case summary of 1987:

En términos generales, el beso entre personas de distinto sexo se ha trivializado sensiblemente en nuestra sociedad, perdiendo progresivamente su tradicional significado de caricia reservada a las personas de mayor intimidad y convirtiéndose en convencional y rutinario saludo, común incluso entre gentes apenas vinculadas por una superficial amistad. Paralelamente el beso en la boca, culturalmente definido en el pasado como hecho máximamente simbólico en el proceso de aproximación de dos amantes, ha sido en cierto

modo devaluado a la mera condición de gesto revelador de una declarada atracción sexual mutua. Ello naturalmente no le ha privado de su carga erótica ni le ha convertido en gesto sin importancia que pueda, sin reproche social, intentarse con cualquier conocido. (Ruíz-Rico, p.127)

The judge's identification of the kiss on the mouth, particularly, as an act carried out by lovers stresses the importance of the site of the kiss in the traditional conception. This point is confirmed by a 1977 case summary in which the judge discussed the matter of whether a kiss might constitute 'abusos deshonestos':

La cuestión de si el beso constituye o no acto idóneo determinante de abusos deshonestos ha sido materia controvertida doctrinalmente de modo tenaz, pero aunque se reconozca que se emplea con frecuencia como salutación, que otras veces es casta manifestación de afecto o cariño conyugal, paterno-filial, parental o amistoso, y que finalmente a veces puede revestir matices jocosos, vejatorios y hasta injuriosos, es cierto que si se da por persona de un sexo a otra del contrario y recae sobre zona claramente erógena podrá constituir por sí mismo [abusos deshonestos]. (Ruíz Rico, p.127)

Even after Spain had freed itself from the grip of a reactionary church, therefore, there was clearly considerable latent unease, at least in more traditional sectors of society, concerning the ambiguous erotic connotations of the various types of kiss. The somewhat ambivalent orthodox posture towards what constitutes an 'erotic kiss', and the importance of the site of contact, may help to explain the fact that the first 'kiss' in *Guillermo el organizador* (no.8), alluded to by Violet Elizabeth when she encounters the Outlaws, is unsuppressed in the proofs. The scene unfolds as follows:

-Tú quizeraz zer una niña pequeña, ¿verdad?

-Ah ... sí. Ya lo creo que sí- respondió el infeliz Guillermo.

-Bézame- dijo ella, alzando la cara.

Guillermo tenía quebrantado el espíritu. Le rozó la mejilla con la suya.

-Ezo no ez un bezo- aseguró Violeta Isabel.

-Es mi clase de beso.

-Bueno. Ahora, jugaremoz a laz hadaz. Yo te enceñaré. (p.45)

The fact that the censor failed to suppress this scene, and yet excised Violet Elizabeth's later allusion to it would seem incomprehensibly inconsistent, unless William's incompetent execution of the manoeuvre was felt to disqualify it as a genuine kiss. As Violet Elizabeth herself points out, 'ezo no ez un bezo'. It nevertheless ultimately still seems inconsistent that the censor should not suppress the scene in which this half-realized kiss takes place, and yet excise Violet Elizabeth's allusion to it later. Violet Elizabeth's suppressed claim that William 'me bezó'

contradicts her earlier assertion to William that 'ezo no ez un bezo'. Since the reader is already aware of the child-like nature of the kiss, having read an unsuppressed description of it, elimination of the later allusion seems pointless: both the initial description of the kiss and the later allusion to it clearly allude to the same childish brushing of cheeks which constitutes William's version of a kiss.

Later, a similar 'kiss' between Violet Elizabeth and Ginger takes place. Here the Outlaws play at being 'redskins', casting Violet Elizabeth in the role of 'squaw'. She agrees, but imposes her own view of how to make the scenario more authentic:

-Bueno- dijo Violeta Isabel. -Ahora dame un bezo de dezpedida.

Pelirrojo la miró con horror.

-Tienes que hacerlo- insistió ella; -¿tu te vas a trabajar y yo me quedo a guisar la comida, tienes que darme un bezo de dezpedida. Siempre lo hacen.

-Yo no- respondió Pelirrojo.

La niña alzó la cara.

-Por favor, Pelirrojo.

Poniéndose colorado hasta las orejas, Pelirrojo le rozó la mejilla con la suya. Guillermo lanzó un resoplido de desdén. (pp.52-53)

Nothing is marked for suppression in this episode in the proofs. Once again, this scene may have been thought acceptable because the 'kiss' is only half carried out. The kiss which Violet Elizabeth solicits here is also of a particular type. In the case of the two earlier kissing scenes discussed above, Violet Elizabeth demands kisses as a direct means of exercising power over the boys. Her soliciting of kisses could also be regarded as an expression of her own sexual awareness. In this scene, however, she is playing a role, and traps Ginger into kissing her by the indirect means of asserting that the kiss is a necessary part of the fantasy scenario they are enacting. Whilst the boys had started out playing their usual game of Red Indians, Violet Elizabeth's insistence on the 'beso de despedida' clearly shows her tricking the Outlaws into playing her own preferred game, which involves simply imitating the routines and behaviour of adults from the children's own social milieu. 'Siempre lo hacen', she says, referring to the kiss between the male leaving for work and his spouse who stays at home cooking. Ginger cannot deny that this is the case, and is thus forced to comply with Violet Elizabeth's demands.

The kiss is thus an integral part of a scene in which the boys' lust for adventure is seen to be curbed by the imposition of a domestic reality. This reality, based on conjugal responsibility and routine, wholly conforms to the orthodox model. Moreover,

the female figure who has tamed the boys by imposing this reality happily takes her place in the home whilst her spouse leaves for work, thus showing an exemplary willingness, in the censor's eyes, to conform to the orthodox domestic model.<sup>4</sup>

The suggestion that this kiss may have been more acceptable than the others, according to the orthodox scheme, is supported by the evidence of *Guillermo y los mellizos* (no.20), in which the chapter 'La dulce niña de blanco' also appears. Although the translator of this later work is named as Conchita Peraire del Molino, whereas Guillermo López Hipkiss had translated *Guillermo el organizador*, it is evident that the typed proofs for this chapter in the censorship file relating to *Guillermo y los mellizos* are a direct transcription of López Hipkiss's version. In the proofs for the later work, however, all episodes involving kisses have been omitted by the transcriber, except the one in which Ginger is persuaded to perform the domestic ritual of kissing his 'wife' before going out to work. Since *Guillermo el organizador* was never published during the Franco era, despite being submitted twice, *Guillermo y los mellizos* provides the only conclusive evidence that Ginger and Violet Elizabeth's valedictory kiss, as part of their enactment of conventional adult life, was considered more acceptable than the other kisses in 'La dulce niña de blanco'.

Interestingly, this episode of the *William* books reappeared in Spain in 1980, as one of the two comic-books published by Molino using stills from the television series. In this case the episode (and the book) were entitled *La dulce damita de blanco* (no.38). Predictably, juvenile kissing had become an acceptable element of children's literature in this twilight period in which a vestigial censorship apparatus still existed: three kisses are included in the narrative, and one is depicted in a softly focused still. In other stills, Violet Elizabeth's underwear is clearly visible as she frolics with the Outlaws during the game of Red Indians. Elsewhere, Violet Elizabeth professes a love for romantic fiction ('me guztan loz libroz de amor'), an interest which would hardly have been thought fitting for a six-year old girl in previous years.

The final instance of the censors objecting to kissing in the *William* books is to be found in the reports on *Travesuras de Guillermo* from 1968 (no.33), when the work was resubmitted having been rejected in 1942 (no.6). The first censor alluded to '[una] escena demasiado insinuante protagonizada por una niña de once años (suprimir)'. The second censor did not define the episode specifically, but nevertheless

marked it for suppression in his copy of the work, and listed the relevant page numbers in his report.

In the episode in question, William finds himself in conversation with a sophisticated new arrival to the area, Ninette Jarrow, described as follows:

Parecía ser que la señorita Ninette Jarrow era una personita maravillosa. Tenía once años de edad. Había visitado todas las capitales de Europa, viendo las mejores obras de arte y oyendo la mejor música una cada una. Había visto todas las obras de teatro que se representaban en Londres por entonces. Y también conocía los últimos bailes. (p.133)

William is not at all interested in the formidable accomplishments of his new acquaintance, however, devoting all his attention to her dishevelled pet mongrel Jumble. William had briefly assumed ownership of the animal, only to be deprived of it by the appearance of its rightful owners, the Jarrows. Ninette nevertheless decides to test her feminine charms on William, in a scene which is ringed and scored out in crayon in the censors copy:

De pronto, ella se detuvo bajo un árbol y alzó su rostro vivaracho hacia él.  
-Puedes besarme si quieres- le ofreció.  
Pero Guillermo la miró sin inmutarse.  
-No quiero, gracias- respondió, cortésmente.  
-¡Qué muchacho más *raro* eres!- comentó ella entonces, soltando cascabelina risa-. ¡Y pareces tan burdo y tan desordenado!... Te pareces a 'Jumble'. ¿Te gusta 'Jumble'?  
-Sí- contestó Guillermo.  
Su voz temblaba. Ya no era el dueño de 'Jumble'.  
-Puedes quedarte con él para siempre jamás- dijo la niña de pronto-. Y *ahora...* ¡bésame!

Guillermo le besó la mejilla, torpemente, como aquel que está decidido a cumplir con su deber; pero, en su fuero interno, experimentaba un alivio enorme.

(Italics as in proofs, pp.133-34)

A little later, Ninette reports on her new playmate to her father:

-¡Es un muchacho *más raro*, papá! No sabe bailar el *jazz* y nunca ha visto a Pawlova y no sabe hablar francés. Le he regalado 'Jumble' [y no quería besarme]. (p.134)

Here, the phrase in square brackets has been ringed and scored out in crayon (italics as in proofs), clearly to maintain consistency with the earlier suppression.

On the same page, however, another section of text which does not relate to the kiss has also been marked for suppression:

-Me gustas- le hizo saber Ninette cuando el muchacho se despidió-. Tienes que venir otra vez. Te enseñaré la mar de cosas. Me parece que me gustaría casarme contigo cuando seamos mayores. Eres tan... *sosegado*. (p.134)

As with previous suppressions, this entire passage has been both ringed and crossed out in crayon (italics as in proofs). This suppression superficially invites comparison with the excision of Tom and Huck's discussion of marriage in the 1967 Sopena edition of *Tom Sawyer* (no.35; pp.197-98, above). In that instance, the censor's declared motive for suppressing the scene was that it promoted, through the figure of Huck '[una] idea negativa sobre el matrimonio'. Clearly, this cannot be so in the case of Ninette's words, however, since she expresses a thoroughly positive and orthodox desire to marry.

It will be recalled that one of the reasons that Ginger's dutiful valedictory kiss was retained whilst other kisses were excised was that the surrounding narrative implicitly advocated an orthodox notion of marriage. The difference here is that whilst marriage itself is advocated by Ninette's proposal, the orthodox model is far from upheld. Firstly, it is clear from Ninette's dubious praise of William, 'eres tan... *sosegado*' (italics as in proofs), that her enthusiasm for marrying him is based on her capacity to manipulate him with ease and (as she perceives it) to impress him with her worldly knowledge and accomplishments. Secondly, whilst Violet Elizabeth was invited, even ordered, to adopt a domestic role as a squaw in a fantasy game that the boys initiated, Ninette's frank proposal to William is wholly unprompted, and does not form part of any fantasy scenario.

It is thus clear that this suppression is motivated by the forwardness and precocity of Ninette, both characteristics which clash with the orthodox model of the female as submissive, and the child generally as innocent. This impression is confirmed by the fact that the censor did not merely excise Ninette's allusion to marriage, he also felt that her simple declaration 'me gustas' required suppression. Furthermore, the censor himself attributed this series of suppressions to his view that the scene was 'demasiado insinuante'. It is evidently Ninette's, and not William's, behaviour which merited the use of this epithet by the censor.<sup>5</sup>

Conveniently, *Tom Sawyer* also contains a scene in which a juvenile kiss figures prominently. In the original text, this scene reads as follows, with Tom speaking first:

'Say, Becky, was you ever engaged?'  
 'What's that?'  
 'Why, engaged to be married.'  
 'No.'  
 'Would you like to?'  
 'I reckon so. I don't know. What is it like?'  
 'Like? Why, it ain't like anything. You only just tell a boy you won't ever have anybody but him, ever ever *ever*, and then you kiss, and that's all. Anybody can do it.'  
 'Kiss? What do you kiss for?'  
 'Why that, you know, is to - well, they always do that.'  
 'Everybody?'  
 'Why, yes, everybody that's in love with each other. Do you remember what I wrote on the slate?'  
 'Ye-yes.'  
 'What was it?'  
 'I shan't tell you.'  
 'Shall I tell *you*?'  
 'Ye-yes - but some other time.'  
 'No, now.'  
 'No, not now - tomorrow.'  
 'Oh, no, *now*, please, Becky. I'll whisper it, I'll whisper it ever so easy.'  
 Becky hesitating, Tom took silence for consent, and passed his arm about her waist and whispered the tale ever so softly, with his mouth close to her ear. And then he added:  
 'Now you whisper it to me - just the same.'  
 She resisted for a while, and then said:  
 'You turn your face away, so you can't see, and then I will. But you musn't ever tell anybody - *will* you, Tom? Now you won't - *will* you?'  
 'No, indeed indeed I won't. Now Becky.'  
 He turned his face away. She bent timidly around till her breath stirred his curls, and whispered, 'I - love - you!'  
 Then she sprang away and ran around the desks and benches, with Tom after her, and took refuge in a corner at last, with her little white apron to her face. Tom clasped her about her neck and pleaded.  
 'Now, Becky` it's all over - all over but the kiss. Don't you be afraid of that - it ain't anything at all. Please, Becky.'  
 And he tugged at the apron and the hands.  
 By and by she gave up and let her hands drop; her face, all glowing with the struggle, came up and submitted. Tom kissed the red lips and said:  
 'Now it's all done, Becky. And always after this, you know, you ain't ever to love anybody but me, and you ain't ever to marry anybody but me, never never and for ever. Will you?'  
 'No, I'll never love anybody but you, Tom, and I'll never marry anybody but you, and you ain't ever to marry anybody but me, either.' (pp.44-45)

Though this scene contradicts the notion of children as devoid of sexuality, it is in some ways comparatively milder, in orthodox terms, than the kissing scenes in the *William* books. A significant mitigating factor is the fact that it is the boy who solicits the kiss, and the girl who is ostensibly reluctant to submit. Becky thus conforms more closely to the orthodox archetype of the female, who should be 'carente por completo de apetitos sexuales' (see p.34, above), than Violet Elizabeth or Ninette. Equally Tom, in adopting a dominant role in the courtship, is closer to the traditional model of the Spanish male, 'machote y agresivo' (see p.88, above) than William and his Outlaws, who are portrayed as bashful victims of a predatory female sexual urge.

As with the more permissible kiss between Violet Elizabeth and Ginger, Tom and Becky's kiss is presented, at least by Tom, as part of an established social ritual. Quite unlike Violet Elizabeth's promiscuous invitation to all the Outlaws, Tom and Becky's kiss is explicitly identified as a pledge of fidelity between the young lovers.

Immediately after the passage quoted above, Tom goes on to explain the implications of the pledge to Becky: 'And always, coming to school, or when we're going home, you're to walk with me, when there ain't anybody looking - and you choose me and I choose you at parties, because that's the way you do when you're engaged.' Becky replies: 'It's so nice. I never heard of it before.' This reply clearly asserts Becky's innocence relative to Tom. This is in sharp contrast to Ninette Jarrow, who in conversation with her father identified William's reluctance to kiss her as a symptom of his oddness. This strongly suggests she has had experience of more willing partners, and that she is more experienced in romantic and sexual matters than William, who is the same age.

Despite the relatively orthodox features of the kissing scene between Tom and Becky, however, it was repeatedly, though not always, suppressed in editions of *Tom Sawyer* in the later Franco era. Instances of official objection to this episode have been identified in Chapter 3 (pp.146-155, above). In some editions in which the kiss was not suppressed by the official censor, the episode was removed or modified by the translator or editor. This applies to Bruguera's 1960 edition (no.24), authorized by Aguirre despite certain reservations, in which the scene reads as follows:

-Bien, ya me lo has dicho, Becky. Pero ahora falta otra cosa.



-¿Qué falta?  
 -Ya te lo dije: el beso.  
 -No, no...  
 -Si no es nada importante. ¡Por favor, Becky!  
 Y se lo dio.  
 -Ahora ya está. (p.56)

Here the specific reference to the site of the kiss in Twain's original ('Tom kissed the red lips') is removed. This is a small but judicious expurgation given the particular significance of the kiss on the lips as a part of foreplay or a signal of sexual intimacy (see p.205, above). The censor of Ferma's 1957 edition (no.20) referred specifically to 'el beso *en los labios*' (my emphasis), indicating that the specific point of contact of the kiss made it less acceptable in the orthodox scheme. The specific allusion to the colour of Becky's lips, suggestively rendered as 'los encendidos labios' in Santainés's version (nos.3, 10, 19, 55), no doubt made the scene less acceptable still to some censors.

#### (ii) Premature love

Bruguera's 1960 edition, which purported to be an adaptation incorporating moralistic interjections (no.24), at least includes the scene in which Tom and Becky pledge their love by exchanging a kiss. Other editions eliminated the scene altogether. One such edition is Ferma's sixty-four page 1963 edition (no.27), in which Tom and Becky become mere 'amigos'. Such drastic modifications are perhaps to be expected in the case of wholesale adaptations of the work, in which considerable pruning of the narrative is inevitable. The Llovet edition of 1964 (no.29), however, is an example of a version which by its appearance purports to be faithful and unabridged, but which significantly moderates the force of the romantic encounters between Tom and Becky. The kiss itself is not present in this edition, and even Tom's initial declaration to Becky, in the form of a written message which in the English reads simply 'I love you' (p.41), is diluted to 'eres muy simpática'.<sup>6</sup>

It is significant that Ferma and Llovet, unlike Bruguera, did not merely eliminate the explicit allusion to physical contact between the young lovers, but also excised any reference to love between the pair. This betrays the orthodox discomfort with the notion of romantic love existing between children at all, whether it was consummated by physical contact or not. This discomfort is explicitly expressed in the

reports on Juventud's 1966 edition (nos. 31 and 33), Bruguera's edition of the same year (no.34) and subsequent reprints of the same edition (nos.40, 44, 46, 49), both Sopena and SRD's 1967 editions (nos.35 and 37), and Plan's edition of 1969 (no.39). In the case of these editions, the censors did not specifically object to either juvenile feminine flirtation, as in the case of *Travesuras de Guillermo* in 1968, nor indeed juvenile masculine flirtatiousness, as in the case of Ferma's 1957 edition of *Tom Sawyer*. Rather, the blanket term 'amores prematuros' is used (or 'amores precoces' in the case of the Plan edition), and all allusions to childish desire or flirtation in *Tom Sawyer* are cited as requiring suppression. Excisions from these editions include Tom and Becky's initial encounter (*Tom Sawyer*, Chapter 3), Becky's arrival at school (Chapter 4), the courtship and kissing scene itself (Chapter 7), and the scene in which Tom and Becky attempt to provoke each other's jealousy by flirting with Amy Lawrence and Alfred Temple respectively (Chapter 19).

The implications of the suppressions carried out under this broad category are rather more far-reaching than in the case of the other evidence relating to the censorship of child sexuality. The reports on *Travesuras de Guillermo* in 1968 establishes the unacceptability of descriptions of kissing, and of the portrayal of a female child character as sexually aware, experienced, and prepared to initiate contact. The report on the 1957 Ferma edition of *Tom Sawyer* confirms the intolerance of descriptions of children kissing, even if it was the male child who initiated such contact, whilst the female child was shown as passive and relatively inexperienced. The embargo on 'amores prematuros', however, seems to reflect the more totalitarian orthodox urge to define children generally not as future adults, with incipient sexual and romantic desires, but rather as creatures untainted by the 'sin' of carnal desire, inhabiting an arcadian realm set apart from sullied adulthood.

This view of the child is vividly reflected in Garmendia de Otaola's assessment of *Tom Sawyer*, in which he states that the work is unsuitable for children because it contains, amongst other things, 'un idilio amoroso entre adolescentes, casi niños, que, aunque limpio, resulta precoz y fuera de lugar' (p.430). The description of Tom and Becky's relationship as 'un idilio' which is 'limpio' reflects the generally orthodox character of that relationship. His objection to their attachment because it is 'precoz y fuera de lugar' confirms that any romantic association between young people,

however much that association conformed to the orthodox model of relations between the sexes, was considered objectionable in a narrative intended to be read by children.

Let us now compare the regime's response to portrayals of young love in *Tom Sawyer* with such portrayals in the *William* books. It is clear from the pattern of steadily increasing opposition in reports on *Tom Sawyer* from 1957 onwards that it was subjected to particularly rigorous appraisal in the later period because its status had changed from that of 'literary classic' to merely 'children's book'. This is evident from the fact that editions of *Tom Sawyer* containing the kiss provoked no objection from the censors in the earlier period. The *William* series, on the other hand, generally improved in prestige after its rehabilitation in the late 1950s. It is therefore interesting to compare scenes from later *William* books in which relations between the sexes are portrayed with such scenes in later editions of *Tom Sawyer*, which were explicitly condemned. This exercise is intended as a parallel to the comparison of religious episodes throughout the previous chapter. It will thus allow us to determine further to what extent *William's* increased prestige, as it was institutionalized as a children's classic, meant that it was in fact treated with greater tolerance than *Tom Sawyer*, which was simultaneously being 'deinstitutionalized', and was therefore subjected to particular scrutiny.

At first sight, it appears that the *William* books published by Molino in the 1950s and 1960s do in fact contain episodes which could be classified under the heading 'amores prematuros', but which were nevertheless not suppressed or even mentioned by the censors. In *Guillermo artista de cine* (no.24), for example, William meets two sisters competitively collecting shells on a beach. William's impression of the second of the two sisters he meets, Angela, is described as follows:

Era una niña mucho más atractiva que Adela. En primer lugar era morena, y a Guillermo jamás le gustaban las rubias. Y en segundo, tenía una boca dulce, mientras que la de Adela era firme y un tanto agresiva. (p.120)

The implication that a boy of William's tender years should have formed an idea of particular physical characteristics he finds attractive in the opposite sex clearly contradicts the orthodox model of the child as sexually unaware. It also somewhat contradicts the model of male sexuality we have seen thus far in the *William* books,

according to which boys are portrayed as lacking any urge towards sexual or romantic contact.

There are other instances, however, in which William is shown to entertain romantic thoughts about a female character. One example is his fantasy about a young woman who comes to lecture at his school in *Guillermo el gángster* (no.16):

Comenzó a hablar diciendo que había demasiada gente que vivía amontonada en casas en las que apenas tenían espacio para respirar, y que todo el mundo debiera dar dinero para llevarles a casas más grandes. Aquello no era muy interesante, así que Guillermo comenzó a imaginarse prisionera de los Pieleros Rojas, y que él con una sola mano se abría camino a través de cientos de ellos, para rescatarla. (p.147)

This whimsical, stereotypical scenario of the damsel in distress, with its strong echoes of the chivalric romance, can hardly compare in 'subversive' potential to Tom's relationship with Becky, which takes place in the real world and has real consequences. Nevertheless, William does actively pursue older women in other episodes in the series, though unfortunately most instances of this occur in works from the persecution era of the 1940s (of those I have thus far consulted in detail), and thus can have no bearing on the question of whether William was latterly treated more leniently than *Tom Sawyer*.

William briefly allows himself to become attracted to a girl of more or less his own age, Lucinda, in *Guillermo el luchador* (no.22), which censor Batanero approved without reservation in 1961. The girl wins his favour by the symbolically intimate gesture of offering him a lollypop she herself has already been sucking. It emerges, however, that Lucinda only wishes to provoke the jealousy of a male third party who has rejected her, again asserting the idea of the female using her sexuality to manipulate and exercise power over members of the opposite sex, evident in the scenes involving Violet Elizabeth and Ninette Jarrow.

In *Guillermo buscador de tesoros* (no.28), Violet Elizabeth attempts to manipulate William and his Outlaws by employing her feminine charms:

La chiquilla se quedó plantada ante ellos, 'abanicándoles' materialmente con los rítmicos movimientos de sus pestañas, que les ocultaban por una fracción de segundo sus azules ojos, derramando, en fin, todo el encanto propio de sus seis años. (p.36)

There would certainly seem to be an element of latent sexual display in Violet Elizabeth's performance here. The notion of a six-year girl employing feminine wiles

to manipulate eleven-year old boys would seem to be far more abhorrent, in the orthodox scheme, than the romantic attachment between Tom and Becky, in which it is the boy, at least, who initiates the girl in sexual knowledge.

It is no doubt significant, however, that in the case of Violet Elizabeth's display, the intended victims are entirely unmoved. The passage continues: 'Pero aquellos varones no parecían muy afectados por el mismo. Despreciaban a Violeta Isabel por su juventud, su carácter abierto, simpático, y su ceceo.' This episode thus fits the pattern discernible in other instances in the *William* books discussed above, in which boys are generally portrayed as less sexually aware than their female counterparts. Though this is the inverse of the orthodox scheme, in which a libidinous (though also ignorant) male was expected to woo a reluctant, saintly female, it nevertheless has the consequence that, occasional 'kisses' aside, contact between boys and girls in the *William* books is rarely of a romantic nature .

Although the relations between the sexes in *Tom Sawyer* fit the orthodox scheme better than the *William* books in the sense that Tom is dominant and Becky ostensibly submissive and less aware, the result is that the couple come to form a stable romantic pair in a way that never occurs in the *William* series. The strength of this bond is brought home towards the end of *Tom Sawyer*, in the episode in which Tom and Becky get lost in the underground cave system, and share their 'wedding cake' (actually a piece of cake from a children's picnic, retained by Becky) in order to keep themselves going (p.159). Here it is only the pair's mutual romantic affection which sustains them throughout the ordeal. It therefore seems likely that it was precisely the much greater degree of intimacy and constancy of the relationship between Tom and Becky, relative to William's passing fancies, which was thought simply too adult to be a feature of a book intended for children.

Ultimately, therefore, the question of whether *Tom Sawyer* was treated more harshly than *William* in the later period because of considerations of prestige cannot be decided purely on the basis of sexual censorship, simply because *Tom Sawyer* does in fact contain 'amores prematuros' in a way in which the later *William* books do not.

(iii) Misogyny and femininity

Thus far, analysis of the sexual censorship imposed on the works has focused principally on passages which were actually suppressed or modified, or which might have been expected to have suffered censorship, but which did not. In the case of the *William* books particularly, it is also worth examining the more general portrayal of relations between the sexes, and gender stereotypes. The material relating to such issues is often not susceptible to direct censorship, because it is dispersed throughout the text and transgresses no specific taboos, but it nevertheless bears on the regime's overall response to the works, since the orthodox model of the child ascribed specific and very separate roles to boys and girls respectively (see pp.33-46, above).

The ambivalent attitude of boys towards girls has already been glimpsed in several scenes involving Violet Elizabeth. Throughout the *William* books, boys claim to despise femininity, but at the same time the narrative makes it clear that they are susceptible to emotional manipulation by female characters. This typically ironic scheme gives rise to a fairly large number of allusions to apparently misogynistic sentiments. Thus Ginger and William are involved in the following exchange in *Guillermo el bueno*:

-¡Mujeres! En toda mi vida no pienso volverles a dirigir la palabra más que cuando sea imprescindible.

-Lo mismo digo.- replicó Guillermo.

Este acuerdo pareció formar un lazo más estrecho entre los dos.

(pp.235-36)

Here, distaste for women is portrayed as the basis for male solidarity. Elsewhere, far more blatantly misogynistic sentiments are attributed to male characters:

Huberto la miró sorprendido e indignado. ¿Cómo se atrevió aquél representante de un sexo inferior y despreciado a alzar su voz, cuando hasta los Proscritos evidentemente lo temían. (*Guillermo el luchador* (no.22), p.77)

Guillermo, pirata, piel roja y desesperado, Guillermo, odiador de mujeres y despreciador de niñas, miró a su alrededor buscando un sitio por donde escapar y no lo encontró. (*Guillermo el organizador* (no.8), p.44)

In both these examples, the misogynistic sentiments are, admittedly, undercut by the ironic tone and the surrounding narrative. It is clear that the allusion to 'un sexo inferior y despreciado' is a reflection of Hubert's own haughtily dismissive opinion of women. It is repeatedly made clear in the series that Hubert, the leader of

a rival gang usually outwitted by the Outlaws, is an unsympathetic character, and in this episode he is shown to be particularly smug and objectionable. His contemptuous opinion of women, expressed in free indirect discourse by Crompton, is thus implicitly undermined.

Similarly, the definition of William as an 'odiador de mujeres y despreciador de niñas' evidently reflects William's image of himself, since the other characterizations of him as pirate, redskin and desesperado all allude to roles he adopts in his fantasies. William's scorn for women is thus not presented as a real sentiment, but rather as a posture he likes to strike.

Elsewhere, the disparity between William's self-image and the reality of his attitude to women is explicitly alluded to: 'Guillermo era - o mejor dicho se creía ser - un enemigo de las mujeres, considerándose invulnerable ante los ataques y ardis del sexo opuesto' (*Guillermo buscador de tesoros* (no.28), p.6). As we have seen, Crompton repeatedly makes comic use of the fact that William's opinion of himself as invulnerable to feminine manipulation is in fact far from the truth. Despite the fact that misogynistic sentiments are mediated by such questions of point of view, it is nevertheless noteworthy that the Francoist censors never objected to such sentiments, or even mentioned them at all. In fact, an entry in a children's literature bibliography makes it clear that the ironical misogyny portrayed in the *William* books was wholly acceptable in the orthodox scheme:

*Guillermo el luchador* (1961): En opinión de Guillermo, el personaje inglés de los libros en serie, todas las niñas son tontas y en esta obra lo demuestran al intervenir desafortunadamente en las travesuras del 'héroe' y sus amigos. Divertido y original.<sup>7</sup>

The author of this entry is careful to specify that the assertion 'todas las niñas son tontas' is the opinion of William, who is identified as 'inglés'. The following phrase 'en esta obra lo demuestran', however, cannot be part of William's opinion (since he exists only within the work) and thus must reflect the author's own assessment of the way women are depicted in the work. It is thus clear that an ostensibly patronizing or even hateful attitude towards women on the part of a male character was considered an acceptable characteristic of a children's work.

This reveals the contradictory nature of the Francoist paradigm of sexual relations. On the one hand, it is unsurprising that ostensibly negative attitudes towards

women were acceptable, given that part of the orthodox gender stereotype determined that women were weak, hysterical and intellectually less well equipped than men. On the other hand, given the orthodox advocacy of the chivalric romance as a suitable model for relations between the sexes (p.40, above), we might expect the presence in a children's book of various characters who profess hatred and contempt for women to have been considered questionable.

The embargo on hatred, also, would seem to be transgressed by some of the allusions to misogynistic sentiments, if taken literally. On the question of hatred, it will be recalled that José de Quintana, in his published attack on the series, alluded to 'odio hacia padres y hermanos' as one of the negative characteristics it portrayed. It is quite clear in the series that the familial 'hatred' alluded to by Quintana reflects the childish hyperbolic use of the word. The narrative always makes it obvious that this 'hatred' in fact refers to the intensely felt but quite harmless irritation of William at being unjustly treated. The fact that Quintana objected to this 'hatred' demonstrates that he attributed no appreciation of point of view to children, and assumed that they would understand William's hatred as genuine, heartfelt malice. Such a patronizingly literal approach is typical of the regime's response to children's literature.

Given this literal-mindedness, it is worth recording that no orthodox source mentioned references to contempt or hatred of women in the *William* books, since this establishes that the misogynistic component of the gender stereotype, which determined that the role of women was subordinate and that they could be legitimately viewed with contempt, had greater weight than the orthodox imperative that women should be exalted as saintly, ethereal figures. Allowing misogynistic sentiments on the part of male characters also implicitly acknowledges the fact that such sentiments reinforce a model of juvenile relations between the sexes in which romantic or sexual contact cannot flourish.

Tom Sawyer, quite unlike William, is generally very enthusiastic about girls, and as a result he forms a relatively stable liaison with Becky, as we have seen. For this reason, once *Tom Sawyer* began to be perceived as a children's book, it encountered severe difficulties, whilst *William* flourished. The evidence of Francoist censorship practice thus reveals that whilst depictions of young love were considered objectionable, representations of ostensible contempt and even hatred between young



people were tolerated and even implicitly condoned. This exposes the shallowness of the declared Francoist espousal of Christian virtues, and reveals that the repression of sexuality as an instrument of control was in fact felt to be a more important concern than the promotion of such virtues.

It could of course be argued that the censors are actually attributing a greater sensitivity to irony to children by allowing misogynistic sentiments in the *William* books, because these are clearly shown to be mere posturing by the surrounding narrative. According to this argument, it is the fact that Tom and Becky's love is real, and therefore precocious according to the orthodox scheme, whereas William and others' hatred of women is not, which determines that the former was objectionable whilst the latter was not. After all, most of the allusions to misogynistic sentiments come from the later period, when the more enlightened censors were somewhat better attuned to the ironic tenor of the series.

However, this argument attributes rather too much subtlety to the censorship apparatus, given what we know of its functioning in practice. Some evidence has already been discussed which shows that the censors did not generally take such contextual considerations into account if the idea itself was sufficiently proscribable (the scene describing Huck's views on marriage (pp.197-98, above) is an example of this). In any case, that the censors should accept misogyny because it was only ostensible or ironically intended, and yet reject love because it was real, hardly suggests a significant evolution towards a more liberal approach.

The incompatibility between female characters in the *William* books and the orthodox conception of femininity has been exemplified in the above discussion of predatory female sexual behaviour in the series. Female characters in the *William* books fail to conform in various other ways to the National-Catholic stereotype, as the following description of Violet Elizabeth demonstrates:

Era de una volubilidad e inconstancia extremadamente femeninas, y a pesar de su juventud (sólo tenía seis años) sabía enfrentarse con cualquier crisis. Para ello poseía multitud de armas ofensivas y defensivas. Sabía llorar de un modo que partía el corazón en un momento dado, y su orgullo era poder vomitar a voluntad, cosa que le valía de mucho ante su madre, quien se dejaba influenciar por las apariencias. [...] En su rostro y en sus ojos azules había una expresión inocente, así como en la sonrisa angelical que curvaba sus labios, de la que los Proscritos habían aprendido hacía much tiempo a desconfiar. (*Guillermo el gángster* (no.16), pp.81-82)

Here the notion that 'volubilidad' is a typical female characteristic clearly contradicts the National-Catholic assertion that girls have 'una tendencia natural hacia la introspección', and that they are 'más reservadas' (p.35, above). Violet Elizabeth's self-possession ('sabía enfrentarse con cualquier crisis'), and her bellicose approach to imposing her will on the world ('poseía multitud de armas ofensivas y defensivas') also contradicts the archetype of the weak, hysterical female.

Above all, it is the description of Violet Elizabeth's capacity for dissimulation which is apparently most unexemplary, since it not only suggests that she lacks innocence, but also that she uses assumptions about childish innocence and feminine frailty to deceive both adults and contemporaries. The use of conscious deceit to achieve selfish ends seems directly to contradict Item 2(h) of the *Reglamento*, which proscribed 'narraciones o dibujos en las que se hace triunfar al protagonista perverso e indisciplinado, pero dotado de fuerza, astucia o doblez'. The devious assumption of an innocent role is also a frequent tactic of William himself, and thus cannot be considered exclusively a matter of gender.<sup>8</sup>

Nevertheless, Violet Elizabeth is portrayed as exploiting stereotypical notions of femininity particularly: much of the humour of this description of her derives precisely from the fact that, unlike William, she *habitually* has the appearance of innocent frailty and malleability, and yet is in fact consciously manipulative. The idea that a six-year old girl should be especially proud of her ability to vomit at will compounds the affront to National-Catholic notions of femininity.

The portrayal of inconstancy and manipulative guile as typically feminine traits nevertheless accords with certain traditional Catholic notions of womanhood. Whilst the primary model propagated for imitation by girls was of the woman as innately disposed towards domesticity, piety, maternity and passivity, the notion of woman as temptress, as demon in the guise of innocence, was well established in fundamentalist Catholic lore.<sup>9</sup>

In fact the primary model, with its emphasis on self-denial and submission to male authority, was no doubt underpinned by the conviction that if women were not persuaded to develop these 'innate' qualities, other more socially disruptive 'essential' characteristics of woman would come to the fore, such as guile and duplicity. Thus as with female sexuality in the *William* books, the notion of women as manipulative

and devious contradicts the primary paradigm, but nevertheless may have been regarded as indirectly instructive in the overall orthodox scheme. It may have been assumed by the censors that the *William* books were read mainly, or even exclusively, by boys, so that allusions to the devious character of women might have been viewed as suitable because they were cautionary, and not susceptible to imitation since girls would not be exposed to them.

In another passage in which Violet Elizabeth is described, the emphasis is somewhat different:

Violet Elizabeth Bott era el terror de los Proscritos. Vivía en un hotel, con sus padres y se pegaba a aquéllos siempre que se le presentaba la ocasión. Sus bisbiseos y su angélica faz proporcionaban una impresión de dulzura y docilidad, pero aunque sólo contaba seis años de edad, era una criatura oficiosa, autocrática, insoportable e irrazonable. Los Proscritos habían hecho de sus tretas para evitarla un fino arte.

(*Guillermo el superhombre* (no.34), p.51)

Here Violet Elizabeth's deceptively innocent appearance is again alluded to, but she is described as openly domineering rather than cunningly manipulative. In *Guillermo artista de cine* (no.24), a similarly formidable female character is described who lacks even the outward appearance of feminine sweetness:

'Esa niña' era Reina Lane [...], una prima de Huberto que estaba pasando una temporada con los Lane y se había constituido miembro de la banda de Huberto. En realidad, ahora era prácticamente la capitana, ya que poseía un grado casi superhumano de determinación, y hubiera sabido dominar a un niño de más coraje que Huberto. Tenía el cabello espeso y corto, una mirada feroz, y ademanes agresivos, y Guillermo la odiaba con especial intensidad. (p.241)

Finally, in *Guillermo el luchador* (no.22), aggressive and domineering behaviour is openly described as typically female, though this view is once again implicitly ascribed to William through free indirect discourse:

La amabilidad de Lucinda era por cierto algo sorprendente. Guillermo no estaba acostumbrado a la amabilidad de las niñas. Por lo general eran agresivas y dominantes, negándose a dejarle tocar sus cosas, y recurriendo a la ayuda de la autoridad contra él a la menor provocación. (p.6)

The notion that girls are typically aggressive and domineering obviously contradicts the primary Francoist paradigm of femininity, according to which girls are 'más reservadas' and 'mansas y obedientes'. Unlike the idea of women as duplicitous, however, there seems to be no possibility of arguing that portraying women as aggressive somehow indirectly accords with deeper National-Catholic prejudices. The

fact that the works in which these descriptions appeared were authorized without reservation must therefore be taken to indicate that unorthodox feminine characteristics other than flirtatiousness were not considered worthy of suppression in children's works. It seems probable, however, that the highly unorthodox depiction of women in the *William* series was one of the characteristics which caused it to be described as being infused with 'absoluta mentalidad inglesa' and therefore 'quizás impertinente para España' in the early period.

#### (iv) Adult sexuality

Thus far, the discussion of the regime's response to sexuality and gender roles in foreign children's literature has focused on portrayals of juvenile characters. The censors' objections to manifestations of sexuality in children's literature have explicitly appealed to the notion that romantic or sexual involvement *between children* is not permissible because it was regarded as precocious. This begs the question of whether representations of adult sexual or romantic involvement were considered more permissible.

The principal sources of such representations in the *William* books are episodes involving William's older brother Robert, aged nineteen. In *Guillermo el organizador* (no.8), for example, the following passage appears:

A través de la existencia de Roberto desfilaba una procesión inacabable de jóvenes dotadas de todas las bellezas del cuerpo y del alma. A cada una de ellas le decía en ronca voz que, desde aquel momento en adelante, dedicaría toda su vida a hacerse más digno de ella. Luego, después de una semana o dos, su sorprendente perfección le parecía menos sorprendente y aparecía en el horizonte otra más perfecta, desquiciando de nuevo el alma tan sensible de Roberto. Afortunadamente, la fidelidad de aquellos seres jóvenes y radiantes estaba a la misma altura que la de Roberto. (pp.207-08)

The obviously ironic tone in this account of Robert's turbulent love life may well have been viewed by the censor as an unacceptable trivialization of a serious matter. This suggestion is supported by the wording of Item Two of the *Reglamento*, which proscribed narratives in which 'el amor sea tratado con excesivo realismo, sin la indispensable idealidad y delicadeza'. Although the *Reglamento* was drawn up after this work passed through censorship, it is clear that the same basic criteria, though unwritten, were being applied in the earlier years.

The humour of this passage derives from its mockery of Robert's hyperbolic idealization of passing adolescent fancies. The passage implies an adolescent milieu in which both males and females repeatedly form and then abandon such attachments with considerable regularity. That such a fickle adolescent ethos should be described in a children's work may well have been thought unexemplary by the censors.

A passing allusion to adult flirtation is also included in the same chapter of *Guillermo el organizador*. The allusion forms part of a scene in which William is planning mischief at a fancy dress party:

El paje Guillermo se había deslizado dentro del guardarropa de señoras y, durante la ausencia temporal de la encargada (que estaba ocupada en flirtear con un chófer bien parecido fuera de la casa), se apropió una capa de señora de terciopelo negro, y una pañoleta de seda. (p.211)

The inclusion of such references in *Guillermo el organizador* was doubtless one of the censor's motives for describing it as 'quizás impertinente para España'.

It will be recalled that various suppressions or modifications were carried out by the editor of this work, probably after certain passages had been marked as unacceptable by the censor. The fact that these unorthodox portrayals of adolescent and adult love were not suppressed or modified in any way suggests that whilst allusions to fickle liaisons between adolescents or between adults may have contributed to the censor's discomfort with the overall world view implied in the work, such allusions were not in themselves considered susceptible to direct suppression. It thus seems that in practice, the 'excesivo realismo' of the *Reglamento* meant actual physical contact, including kissing, between lovers.

In *William* books published in the later period, allusions to Robert's love life are relatively common and equally ironical. In *Guillermo amaestrador de perros* (no.23), for example, Robert's habitual loss of interest after his brief passions is described: 'Caía entonces en la cuenta de que el objeto de su afecto era - como todas las de su sexo - irritable, quisquillosa, egoísta, y ni la mitad de bonita de lo que él creyó al principio' (p.247).

Long sections of the chapter in which this description appears recount scenes between Robert and his latest innamorata, Phillipa, with little or no intervention from William. Phillipa is described as being an avid consumer of romantic fiction and

cinema: 'Le gustaban las películas y las novelas románticas. No le importaba que fuesen inverosímiles, con tal que fuesen románticas' (p.268).

It is possible to argue that the apparently unorthodox implications of these allusions are offset by considerations of point of view. Thus the description of women as bad-tempered gossip-mongers is clearly presented as the opinion of Robert, who is frankly described as oscillating between hyperbolic exaltation and round condemnation of the same female characters. As discussed above, misogynistic sentiments such as those expressed by Robert may also be regarded as being in consonance with the notion of woman as hysterical and weak, a notion which underlay the primary paradigm of the saintly, chaste mother figure. Phillipa's addiction to romance is ultimately revealed as folly, and thus accords with similar cautionary tales in history and fiction, such as those of Don Quixote and Saint Teresa.

Nevertheless, the fact that the censors did not object to subplots such as this, in which adolescent characters both male and female are portrayed as frivolous players in a continual melodrama of romantic excess, and in which William has very little participation, seems to confirm that the censors latterly accepted the ironic character of the *William* books, and their appeal to readers of different ages.

## Conclusion

The evidence reveals that kisses between juvenile characters in works or editions of works considered to be intended for children were habitually, though not always, suppressed. If the kiss was not in fact considered to have been fully realized, and if the context suggested a fantasy scenario in which children imitated orthodox adult behaviour, these seem to have been considered mitigating factors.

Openly flirtatious behaviour on the part of juvenile female characters was explicitly condemned by the censors, and was consistently suppressed.

The evidence of *Tom Sawyer* reveals that stable romantic liaisons between juvenile characters were considered inappropriately precocious in works or editions considered to be intended for children, but not in those works or editions which were not considered as such.

Misogynistic sentiments in the *William* books were never condemned by the censors, suggesting that they may have implicitly condoned such sentiments because

they accorded with certain orthodox prejudices, and because they were preferable to manifestations of attraction between juvenile characters. Portrayals of female characters in the *William* books who contradicted the orthodox gender stereotype were never specifically condemned by the censors. Such portrayals probably contributed, however, to the official opinion in the 1940s that the world of *William* was alien to the Spanish child, a view which led to the censorship of various titles.

The tolerance shown in the later period towards portrayals of adolescent or adult flirtation and romantic involvement in the *William* books suggests a tacit acknowledgement on the part of the censors that the series appealed to a wide age-range. There is also a sense that the series' popularity meant that minor instances of 'adult' themes entering the narrative were overlooked.

## NOTES:

1. *The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction*, trans. by Robert Hurley (London: Penguin, 1979), p.69.
2. Isabel Irigaray Echevarry, *Quiéreme con locura*, Bruguera, 6152-60/13048; Juan Lozano Rico, *Tu pasión mortal*, Bruguera, 7359-68/19198.
3. Loló de la Torre, *Memoria y Razón de Diego Rivera*, Ancla, 984-60/12683.
4. Later in *Guillermo el organizador* (no.8), Violet Elizabeth persuades William and his Outlaws to participate in another scenario based on imitating adult behaviour. Again she is portrayed as willingly adopting her domestic role: '-Y ahora vete al despacho, querido Guillermo, y yo me cuidaré de la cazaca de la caza.' As her use of the imperative here suggests, however, Violet Elizabeth does not consider a submissive attitude to be a necessary element of the part she is playing: 'Adiós y trabaja mucho y gana mucho dinero, porque quiero comprar mucha tela nueva. No tengo nada que ponerme. [...] Vuelve a comer y tráeme una caja de bombones y un ramo muy grande de flores' (p.144).
5. The suspicion that it is Ninette's gender which made her marriage proposal particularly disquieting to the censor is confirmed by the fact that a very similar proposition made by William to Joan, also in *Guillermo el organizador*, is not marked for suppression in the proofs:
  - Sí ... y voy a casarme contigo cuando sea mayor, si no me pides que te diga estupideces románticas que nadie entiende.
  - ¡Oh, gracias Guillermo! ... No; no te pediré eso. (p.272)
6. The pages of the censorship proofs for the Llovet edition are not numbered.
7. Gabinete de Lectura Santa Teresa de Jesús, *Selección de lecturas para niños y adolescentes* (Madrid: Servicio Nacional de Lectura, 1963), p.70.
8. There are numerous examples of unsuppressed descriptions of William adopting an innocent or virtuous guise, often in order to promote some devious enterprise, as the following examples illustrate:
  - Guillermo adoptó una expresión inocente. Nadie tenía un aire más sincero que Guillermo cuando no decía la verdad, y que engañara aun a los más expertos. (Proofs *Guillermo el bueno*, p.135)
  - Guillermo [...] llegaba con aquella expresión de imbecilidad y inocencia que para todos los que le conocían bien anunciaba peligro. (ibid., p.204)
  - Guillermo recién salido de manos de su madre aparecía pulcro y pulido, y esto le daba un falso aspecto de melancólica virtud. (Proofs, *Guillermo amaestrador de perros*, p.225)
- As with the references to Violet Elizabeth's wives, such allusions can be considered especially unorthodox, since they show not only that William is far from innocent, but that he consciously employs assumptions about childhood innocence in order to deceive. Though never suppressed, such descriptions no doubt contributed to orthodox discomfort with the series generally in the earlier period.
9. Catherine Jagoe, *Ambiguous Angels: Gender in the Novels of Galdós* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California, 1994), p.16.



## CHAPTER SIX: AUTHORITY and POLITICS, NATION and RACE

It is not easy to man the ramparts in defense against the barbarians on all sides, and those who bear the burden need all the help they can get. (Noam Chomsky)<sup>1</sup>

### Introduction

In Chapter 4, the regime's response to mockery of one type of figure in authority, ministers of the Church, was discussed. Whilst ridicule of the Church and of priests was the principal source of objections relating to attacks on authority in *Tom Sawyer* and the *William* books, disparaging allusions to other institutions and personages were also identified as objectionable, and in some cases suppressed, by the Francoist censors. Such allusions are the subject of the first section of this chapter, which focuses particularly on satirical allusions to teachers and political figures, whether local or national. The portrayal of politics and political ideologies generally in children's books is also discussed, particularly with reference to the *William* books.

In Chapter 2, it was noted that Item 2(g) of the 1956 *Reglamento* prohibited 'toda desviación del humorismo hacia la ridiculización de la autoridad de los padres, de la Santidad de la familia y del hogar, del respeto a las personas que ejercen autoridad, del amor a la patria y de la obediencia a las leyes' (p.93, above). In accordance with the Francoist notion of society as a series of interlocking hierarchies, respect for authority of various kinds was considered to be linked to patriotic sentiments. It is thus logical to examine the censors' responses to representations of patriotism alongside the theme of authority. Such representations are considered in the second part of the chapter. Relatedly, the regime's somewhat surprising response to portrayals of racial prejudice, particularly relevant in the case of Twain's works, is also discussed in the second part of the chapter.<sup>2</sup>

### Part I: Authority and Politics

#### (i) Parents, teachers and other adults

It is clear from the substitutions carried out in several of the early *William* translations that religious figures lay at the top of the hierarchy of protected groups in the Francoist scheme. As was suggested above (p.178), it is possible to argue that the fact that the non-religious authorities ridiculed in the modified proofs were foreign may have been an important factor in determining that they were more acceptable targets

of mockery than clerics. Because the authority vested in them emanated from an entirely different political system, the censors might have reasoned, ridicule of such figures was not especially objectionable. According to this argument, the censors worked on the principle that only attacks on authorities considered valid in the Francoist scheme were considered worthy of suppression.

In order to validate this interpretation, however, one must account for the fact that attacks on priests who are clearly identified as belonging to a rival and abhorred confession were nevertheless suppressed in both the *William* books and *Tom Sawyer*. One could attempt to argue that the common Christian basis of the two confessions identified them more closely than equivalent political figures, or that the *role* of priests in their respective societies was somehow more similar than the role of civil authorities. These arguments are not at all convincing, however, for there is little evidence that the censors considered children capable of appreciating such nuances.

The explanation must therefore be much simpler: the majority of the censors were themselves clerics, and they were thus predisposed to protect the dignity of their own kind with particular zeal. In the area of children's literature in particular, in which the censorship apparatus was overwhelmingly dominated by representatives of the Church, the system was weighted heavily in favour of religious over political censorship. This is reflected in the 1956 *Reglamento*, in which a whole category of prohibitions (Items 1(a) to 1(d)) relates to religious allusions, whilst attacks on other types of authority are dealt with in a single item (2(g)).

Given this balance, it is not surprising to encounter attacks on non-religious authorities which were not suppressed or identified as objectionable by the censors. This particularly applies to the *William* books, which contain numerous disparaging allusions to figures or institutions which represent authority. The following examples should suffice to illustrate the relative tolerance of the Francoist censors towards such allusions.

The approach to parental authority in the *William* books, firstly, hardly conforms to the orthodox notion of unquestioning obedience. At one point Henry rails bitterly against his father, who has withheld his pocket-money as a punishment:

Existen *leyes* que impiden a la gente apoderarse del dinero de los demás, pero mi padre ... -agregó con sarcasmo,- no parece haberse enterado. Cualquiera día se verá en un buen apuro si continúa apoderándose del dinero de los demás.

Ha empezado conmigo, porque sabe que no puedo vengarme, pero pronto empezará con los demás como dice el Vicario que hace la gente que empieza por robar cosas pequeñas y entonces se meterá en un buen lío. (*Guillermo el bueno* (no.9), p.97)

Henry's insinuation that his father is stealing by taking his pocket-money, rather than fairly exercising his authority, shows the child using the moral teachings of adults against them, a common feature of Crompton's narratives. The child's injured sense of justice reflects his refusal to accept that adult authority is absolute. Although he concedes that he is impotent in the face of it, Henry regards his father's sanction as an act of tyranny. The independence of mind that this indignation reflects was clearly not a desirable feature of the Francoist model child. The boy's sarcasm would have made his posture all the more unexemplary in orthodox eyes.

*Guillermo el bueno* also contains examples of the Outlaws' dismissive attitude towards teachers, and towards education generally. At one point, the narrative alludes to the headmaster's practice of placing the most unprepossessing pupils at the back of the hall during lectures by visiting speakers. The Outlaws' position in the scheme of things is predictable:

Los Proscritos siempre quedaban relegados a la última fila, cosa que para ellos no era un insulto, sino que al contrario, lo agradecían. Allí podían esconderse estratégicamente del campo visual de las Autoridades, y entregarse por entero a batallas navales, al intercambio de envoltorios de cigarrillos, o a 'carrerras' de insectos que llevaban en cajas de cerillas. (p.206)

Elsewhere, the Outlaws' instinctive rejection of the authority of their school is alluded to in a more subversively general fashion:

Durante aquellas vacaciones los Proscritos habían adquirido una gran afición por el cricket. Claro que en años anteriores lo emplearon como pasatiempo, pero sin interés y con la contrariedad producida de todos los juegos organizados por las jerarquías de la escuela, y por lo tanto lo consideraron carente de emoción y de sentido. [...] No fue hasta estas últimas vacaciones cuando los Proscritos consideraron al cricket como un juego digno de jugarse aun sin estar bajo la mirada de las Jerarquías. (p.99)

Later, the Outlaws's automatic scorn for knowledge dispensed by figures in authority is similarly revealed in their dismissive response to Douglas's account of the eruption of Vesuvius: 'Esta información como procedente de la Autoridad y alarde de sabiduría fue pasada por alto' (p.226).

In *Guillermo el superhombre* (no.34), as mentioned above (p.142), William's vision of utopia includes the suppression of all education, because: 'Estoy liado toda mi vida con el asunto de la educación y no veo que ésta me haya hecho ningún bien. Pienso frecuentemente que lo habría pasado mejor sin ella' (p.3). Later he remarks 'supongo que todos estaremos conformes en que no habrá escuelas' (p.5). William also insists that houses should be suppressed and that life would be much easier and more interesting if everyone lived in huts (p.5). This view could be viewed as an assault on 'la Santidad [...] del hogar' (Item 2(g)).

Returning to *Guillermo el bueno* (no.9), the Outlaws' deliberate provocation of the local farmer, by trespassing on his land, is frankly described:

El Granjero Jenks odiaba a los Proscritos con el odio profundo que todos los propietarios sienten hacia los invasores de sus campos. [...] Por consiguiente por mucho que fueran perdiendo novedad las actividades normales de los Pieleros representados por los Proscritos, siempre tenían el estímulo de que en cualquier momento apareciera en escena la tribu enemiga, en la figura del Granjero Jenks, y este conocimiento daba al juego el aliciente de peligro y emoción sin el que los Proscritos encontraban la vida tan árida. (p.126)

It should be noted that all of these examples come from the later period, in which *William* experienced few censorship difficulties of any kind. The fact that such unorthodox attitudes to authority were permitted is still significant, nevertheless, since scenes portraying disrespect for authority were frequently identified as objectionable by the censors of *Tom Sawyer* and of *Huckleberry Finn* in this era, as will become apparent in the course of the present chapter. With regard to *William*, this tolerance is particularly significant in the case of *Guillermo el bueno*, which cannot have been favoured by the positive precedent later accumulated by the series, since it was the first work published after the era of *William's* effective prohibition. The fact that *Guillermo el bueno* attracted no censorship in this area, and yet Twain's works did, again suggests that *Tom Sawyer* and *Huckleberry Finn's* relegation from classic novel status to that of mere children's book caused the censors to evaluate them with unusual harshness.

However, even in the case of the *William* books there were limits to the degree of disrespect for authority which could be portrayed. The clearest instance of censorship relating to the area defined by Item 2(g) of the *Reglamento* occurred as a result of the 1968 application to publish *Travesuras de Guillermo* (no.33). One of the

censors recommended the suppression or modification of an episode 'por atentar seriamente al respeto que merecen los mayores por parte de cualquier muchacho menor, por parte de cualquier niño'. The other censor alluded to the same episode as '[una] travesura de Guillermo que pasa de la raya', and suggested that the unexemplary effect was compounded because 'después de ella es premiado por su padre'. This censor also indicated that the scene should be either modified or suppressed.

In the scene in question, as remarked in Chapter 3, William charges money to crowds of children for the privilege of filing past his Aunt Emily, who is asleep and snoring heavily, as part of an improvised 'show' he has organized. William has placed a notice by his Aunt, identifying the 'exhibit' for the benefit of the crowds, which in the translation appears as follows:

MUJER GORDA, SALVAJE,  
HABLANDO IDIOMA  
INDÍGENA (p.116)

He later puts together an accompanying tableau, consisting of Aunt Emily's dentures, a lock of her hair, and her comb, which he displays alongside their respective labels:

DENTADURA DE LA MUJER GORDA  
SALVAJE

PELO DE LA MUJER GORDA SALVAJE

PEINE DE LA MUJER GORDA SALVAJE (p.118)

The success of this 'exhibit' doubles the profits of William and Henry from their enterprise. Inevitably, Aunt Emily awakens and is incensed. She immediately packs and leaves the Brown household, remarking that were it not for the humiliations suffered that afternoon, she would have stayed until spring. William's father mops his brow with relief on hearing this remark. William awaits the wrath of his father, but is relieved to receive nothing more than a half-hearted reprimand, which is clearly issued more for the benefit of William's listening mother than anything else. Mr. Brown then slips his son two and a half shillings for the service he has performed.

Mr Brown's motives for wishing to see Aunt Emily gone are far from unreasonable: she is portrayed as a difficult malingerer, who divides her time almost entirely between sleeping and eating vast quantities.<sup>3</sup> Nevertheless, it is quite clear that this episode contravenes the letter of Item 2(g) of the *Reglamento* ('toda desviación

del humorismo hacia la ridiculización [...] de la Santidad de la familia'). The examples discussed above, however, suggest that other transgressions of this Item were not deemed objectionable by the censors.<sup>4</sup> This inconsistency may be explicable, as was suggested in Chapter 3 (pp.140-42), by the fact that the publication of *Travesuras de Guillermo* coincided with a resurgence of reactionary zeal in censorship circles generally. This resurgence may have temporarily nullified *William's* accumulated prestige, provoking a somewhat harsher response than usual on the part of the censors.

It is significant, however, that both censors were prepared to allow the episode involving Aunt Emily to be included, as long as it was modified. This suggests that the censors were not in fact objecting to the mere fact that an adult family member was mocked in this episode, but rather that the mockery was of such a blatant and savage kind (as they perceived it). This notion that it was the *degree* of subversive content in this episode which rendered it objectionable, rather than the mere fact of transgressive behaviour, tends to be confirmed by the first censor's allusion to '[una] travesura de Guillermo que pasa de la raya' (my emphasis). This again confirms that the *Reglamento*, at least in the case of works which had acquired sufficient prestige, had very much become an idealized, totalitarian expression of the regime's attitude to children's literature. It is clear that '*toda* desviación' overstated the case as far as much censorship practice was concerned, as the examples of unsuppressed attacks on authority in the *William* books demonstrate.

The second censor, whose tone betrays his considerable indignation at the passage, nevertheless only identified several short sections of text whose suppression he considered obligatory. On pages 116, 117 and 118, all of these sections contain allusions to Aunt Emily as '*mujer gorda, salvaje*'. On page 121, the censor marked for suppression the final nine lines of the passage, which describe William being rewarded by his father. It is thus clear that the most scandalous elements of this episode were: firstly, the strength of the insult directed at Aunt Emily, and William's audacity in committing it to paper (one of the suppressed allusions to the offending notice occurs in an illustration of the scene); secondly, the fact that William's father rewards his son's mischief.

One means of testing whether it was the particular content of this episode, or additional censorship zeal during the era in which the work was submitted, which

determined the censors' responses is to compare the official reaction to a similar 'control' episode. In the *William* books I have thus far consulted in detail, there is perhaps only one example of an episode in which an adult figure is ridiculed to the same extent as Aunt Emily in *Travesuras de Guillermo*, and in which William and his gang are clearly shown to gain from their subversive activities. In the episode in question, entitled 'A Bit of Blackmail', the Outlaws take clandestine photographs of the local sauce magnate, Mr. Bott, whilst he is exercising (*Still William*, pp.76-88). The photographs of the squat, obese Mr. Bott are described in considerable detail, and the Outlaws openly revel in the undignified scenes they have recorded for posterity. They use the pictures to blackmail Bott into allowing an indolent but sympathetic gardener to keep his job on the tycoon's estate. Unfortunately, this episode appears in *Guillermo el organizador* (no.8), which Molino submitted in the era in which the censors were generally ill-disposed towards the series. Given the more or less systematic refusal of applications to publish the *William* books in this era, and the lack of allusions to specific objections in the censors' reports, it is impossible to determine whether this episode was considered especially unacceptable.

The suppression of a brief but openly derogatory allusion in *Guillermo y la guerra* (no.29), however, tends to confirm that mockery of non-religious authority was generally deemed intolerable only when it was considered excessively direct or malicious. The passage marked for suppression by the censor, and omitted from the published version, reads as follows (William is the speaker):

-¿Os acordáis cuando escribimos al Gobierno pidiendo que nos dejara ser comandos y ni siquiera nos contestaron? *¿Y la otra vez que escribimos pidiendo que cerrasen los colegios y enviaran todos los maestros a la guerra para terminarla deprisa, porque todos son tan salvajes, y tampoco nos contestaron jamás?* (p.119)

Here the phrase I have italicized was marked for suppression in the proofs by underlining in red ink. It is interesting to compare this suppressed passage with the unsuppressed allusions to the children's contempt for authority in *Guillermo el bueno* (pp.230-31, above). The unsuppressed passages imply a habitual rejection of authority which is at least as subversive as the children's impertinent but inconsequential letter to the government concerning teachers. The difference is that the suppressed passage, as with the suppressed sections in *Travesuras de Guillermo*, contains a specific insult

('son tan salvajes'), which clearly 'leapt off the page' at the censor, and provoked him or her into excising the offending text.

A parallel can thus be drawn between the censorship of subversion in children's literature and the censorship of sexuality in adult literature: in both cases, the degree of explicitness of the allusion appears to have determined whether it was considered worthy of suppression (see p.204, above). Thus if the mockery of authority was sufficiently indirect, it was not suppressed. This is not to say, of course, that mockery of authority was not an important consideration in the censorship of children's books. It is clear from reports on the *William* books from the persecution era that if subversive attitudes were dispersed throughout the text, and could thus not be suppressed in a piece-meal fashion, they could adversely affect the censors' overall judgement of a children's work, and provoke its outright prohibition in certain circumstances. Once a work or series had acquired sufficient positive precedent, however, the censor's policy on suppressions appears to have been governed by the principle of explicitness adumbrated above. In the area of subversion, this meant that obligatory suppressions were limited to specific or outright insults or 'name-calling', whilst scenes in which children were merely *shown* debunking authority, or in which figures in authority were otherwise ridiculed only implicitly by the tone or structure of the narrative, were usually considered tolerable.

As we shall see below with reference to *Tom Sawyer*, the particular content of the insult suppressed in *Guillermo y la guerra*, asserting the savagery of teachers, may also have had a bearing on the censor's decision to excise the allusion. The suppression in some editions of *Tom Sawyer* of a passage in which a teacher is portrayed as sadistic suggest this was an area of particular sensitivity for the Francoist censors (see p.243, below).

Official bibliographies of children's works provide interesting supplementary evidence concerning orthodox discomfort regarding the subversion of authority in the *William* books. The *Catálogo crítico* of 1961 is particularly revealing since it contains entries on the first works to be published after the era of prohibition.<sup>5</sup> Since *William's* reputation was not yet fully established in Spain in this period, the compilers' judgements are less likely to have been affected by considerations of prestige. Given that reactionary sectors still held sway in Spanish society in the late 1950s, it is also



improbable that the compilers in this era would have felt any obligation to simulate progressive tendencies. Accordingly, although their judgements generally recognize the comic value of the works, they frequently express reservations, particularly concerning the portrayal of attacks on authority by children.

A somewhat uncharacteristic degree of sensitivity to narrative viewpoint is evident in the entry on *Guillermo el gángster*, which warns that 'las travesuras no son castigadas' (p.115). This suggests that portrayals of childish pranks or other unorthodox behaviour were not necessarily thought objectionable in themselves, as long as the perpetrator was shown to suffer as a consequence of his or her actions. This suggestion is certainly supported by certain cautionary tales published under Franco. An extreme example of this genre is discussed in Chapter 7 (pp.276-80, below).

Even greater sensitivity to point of view is evident in the entry on *Guillermo el amable* (no.18), in which it is asserted that 'se justifica el poco respeto a los hermanos mayores porque la autora les presenta llenos de defectos y sobre todo vanidosos' (p.114). The initial verb here, 'se justifica', is revealing: the compilers were no doubt aware that any condemnation of the works included in the *Catálogo* could be viewed as an implicit assertion of the inadequacy of the official censorship apparatus. By explaining why an apparently unorthodox feature of a work was in fact 'justifiable', the compilers managed to alert their readers to dubious elements, but without raising the question of why publication of the work was allowed by the official censors in the first place. The possible objections of more intransigent sectors of society, who might still share Quintana's indignation at the portrayal of ill-feeling between siblings and amongst other family members in the *William* books, were thus simultaneously acknowledged and obviated.

The direct links between the *Catálogo crítico* compilers and the official censorship apparatus also allow us to deduce, however, that such considerations of point of view may have been important in determining *William*'s positive reception in the later era. We have already noted how certain Spanish commentators on *William* emphasized the quintessentially English character of the series (Chapter 3, endnote 16, and p.139, above). The mitigating effect of the foreign setting seems to underlie the observation that 'la autora les presenta [a los hermanos mayores] llenos de defectos

y sobre todo vanidosos', since such a negative presentation would surely not have been acceptable in the portrayal of a Spanish family.

Further evidence that the foreign setting and alien character of the works were latterly considered reasons for tolerating their subversive content is indirectly provided by the entry on *Guillermo el empresario* (no.11): 'La autoridad de las personas mayores queda mal parada, pero no parece posible que estas excentricidades sean imitadas por los niños; además todas [las aventuras] acaban mal para los protagonistas, con fracaso o castigo' (p.115). Here, the orthodox overall scheme of the work, in which childish mischief is always shown to bring failure or punishment in its wake, clearly counts in its favour. The significant additional feature of this entry, however, is the compiler's observation that the 'excentricidades' contained in the work are probably not susceptible to imitation. The use of the word 'excentricidades' seems to suggest again that the foreign, quintessentially English character of the work, and of its protagonist, rendered it harmlessly exotic in the eyes of this particular compiler. It seems that Spanish children moulded in the austere ethos of the Francoist education system were thought simply incapable of seeking to emulate William's extravagantly subversive enterprises.

It is of course ironical that the foreign setting may have come to be viewed as a mitigating factor of the *William* books in the later period, since it was cited as a reason for prohibiting several titles outright in the 1940s (nos.5, 6, 7, 8). Based on this evidence alone, however, it would be going too far to postulate an overall evolution from an early era of children's literature censorship in which the foreign setting of a work counted against it, to a later era in which it was considered a mitigating factor. The harsh censorship of *Tom Sawyer* in the later period, despite the fact that its setting is even further removed in time and space from Franco's Spain, suggests that any mitigating effects of a work's foreign setting could be nullified by other more immediate considerations, such as the sheer quantity of subversive or inappropriate content in the work. The suppression of the passage in *Travesuras de Guillermo* (no.33), and the second censor's report, tends to confirm the impression that the foreign setting was a somewhat peripheral consideration, which may have influenced the censors to be rather more tolerant of attacks on authority than they would be with

a work set in Spain, but only as long as such attacks were neither too overt, nor part of a work which was also objectionable on other grounds (such as *Tom Sawyer*).

Entries on other works, however, seem to suggest that the compilers were far from certain as to whether *William* was simply too far-fetched to be dangerous. The report on *Guillermo el atareado* (no.13), for example, strikes an ambivalent note: 'Algunas travesuras son muy graciosas, pero otras bastante irrespetuosas con las personas mayores, lo que podría ser causa de imitación por parte de lectores poco sensatos' (pp.114-15). This report also demonstrates the orthodox ambivalence with regard to Crompton's humour. It is clear that the compiler could not help but find the work amusing ('algunas travesuras son muy graciosas'), but nevertheless felt the subversive content to be unexemplary for children. This reflects once again the orthodox preoccupation with the inculcation of conformity through children's literature, and the consequent unease regarding subversive humour in children's books. That this unease was a particularly prevalent sentiment with regard to children's literature, specifically, is apparent in the entry on *Guillermo el rebelde* (no.15): 'Poniendo en ridículo a las personas mayores y a instituciones que critica de manera poco apropiada. Divertirá a los mayores' (p.115).

The entry for *Tom Sawyer* in the same edition of the *Catálogo* (which refers to the Bruguera edition of 1959) confirms that the increasing preoccupation regarding *Tom Sawyer's* suitability as a children's work was motivated to a considerable extent by its subversive content: 'Hay algunas burlas de las personas mayores de mal gusto' (p.102). It is significant, however, that specific objections to mockery of the local Sunday school teacher, and of another schoolmaster (the only features of the work in this category of censorship which were repeatedly considered objectionable) arose only in the period of greatest intransigence towards the work generally (nos.31, 33, 34, 35, 37, 40). In other negative reports from the later period, only a 'core group' of fundamental objections, relating to religion, sexuality and criminal behaviour, appears (nos.20, 23, 27, 39, 44, 45, 46, 49, 50, 51). This again suggests that ridicule of non-religious authority was a less immediate concern than unorthodox portrayals of religion or sexuality.

This hierarchy of orthodox concerns can be appreciated by comparing successive official censorship reports on the Editorial Bruguera's edition in the

'juvenil' category. When this edition was first criticized in detail, in 1966, the censor identified an episode containing 'burlas al maestro' as one of his objections (no.34). In later reports, the censor continued to recommend suppressions, but these were limited to those episodes considered most inappropriate for children, namely the murder scene in the cemetery, the love scenes between Tom and Becky, and the allusion to Injun Joe's funeral at the end of the novel (nos.44, 46, 49). It is thus clear that the mockery of the school teachers was considered less objectionable by the censors than similar attitudes directed at religious authority or inappropriate sexual allusions.

The first objections to pejorative descriptions of school teachers surfaced in Sartorius's report on Juventud's 1966 edition. Sartorius took exception to an episode early in the novel, which he described as containing 'burlas al maestro y a una escuela dominical, referentes al estudio de la Biblia'. The fact that the 'burlas' in question take place in the setting of the Sunday school means that this objection also belongs, to some extent, to the category of religious censorship. The 'maestro' is not himself a cleric, however, so that the censor's objection to any mockery of him is likely to have been motivated as much by his status as a figure in authority as by the religious setting.

In the original text of this episode, any mockery of the teacher, Mr. Walters, is extremely gentle. Twain describes his idiosyncrasies of dress, and his adoption of an especially reverential tone of voice for his Sunday school performance. Though this latter trait derives from an earnest piety Twain evidently found somewhat absurd, he nevertheless describes Mr. Walters as 'very sincere and honest at heart' (*Tom Sawyer*, p.23).

Given the very inoffensive nature of Twain's wry allusions to Mr. Walters, it seems probable that Sartorius also had another sense of the word 'burla' in mind, other than 'mockery', when he worded his objection. In the episode in question, Tom barter various goods he has acquired in order to amass the tickets which are awarded to pupils for memorizing passages of Scripture. Eventually, he accumulates enough to claim the right to be publicly presented with a Bible. Tom is less interested in the prize itself than in 'the *éclat* that came with it' (italicized as in original; *Tom Sawyer*, p.23). He presents his claim in front of the visiting Judge Thatcher, in order to impress

the Judge's daughter Becky, the object of his love. Mr. Walters is suspicious of Tom's acquisition of the tickets, but is clearly unaware of the ruthless trading which takes place amongst his pupils. Sartorius registered his disapproval of Tom's actual claiming of the prize in a separate, subsequent objection ('engaño de Tom para conseguir un premio sin merecimiento'), but the initial bartering activity occurs as part of the description of the Sunday school generally, and before the description of Mr. Walters himself. It may be that Sartorius was also referring to the children's irreverently mercantile attitude to the Bible-study incentives system when he used the word 'burla' (in the sense of evasion of control).

With regard to the episode as a whole, it is interesting to note that Sartorius objected to it despite the fact that Tom's subterfuge is discovered, and he suffers public humiliation as a consequence. He is asked to demonstrate the knowledge he has acquired by telling Judge Thatcher and his wife who the first two disciples were. After Tom's catastrophic response, 'David and Goliath!', Twain abruptly concludes the episode with the words 'let us draw the curtain of charity over the rest of the scene' (*Tom Sawyer*, p.27). The Llovet edition, which contains numerous moralizing embellishments on the original text, adds a coda which reveals the root of orthodox discomfort with this episode:

Corramos un tupido velo caritativo sobre el resto de la escena, aunque no hace falta añadir que la trapacería de Tom fue descubierta y por ello sufrió el merecido castigo.

Tom comprendió entonces que había obrado mal y en su fuero interno prometió no hacerlo más. Los premios había que conquistarlos por el propio esfuerzo y no a costa de los demás. (pages not numbered in proofs)

It is thus Tom's devious attempt to beat ('burlar') the conventional system, in which reward is achieved by honest endeavour, which offended orthodox sensibilities.

The other episode in this category listed by Sartorius in his report constitutes a much more unequivocal example of ridicule aimed at a non-religious figure of authority. In this case, the master in question is a Mr. Dobbins, quite a different character from Mr. Walters:

The schoolmaster, always severe, grew severer and more exacting than ever, for he wanted the school to make a good show on 'Examination' day. His rod and his ferule were seldom idle now - at least among the smaller pupils. Only the biggest boys, and young ladies of eighteen and twenty, escaped lashing. Mr. Dobbins's lashings were very vigorous ones too; for although he carried,

under his wig, a perfectly bald and shiny head, he had only reached middle age, and there was no sign of feebleness in his muscle. As the great day approached, all the tyranny that was in him came to the surface; he seemed to take a vindictive pleasure in punishing the least shortcomings. (*Tom Sawyer*, p.109)

As a consequence of this tyranny, the boys in the school do not limit their mischief to trading tickets:

They threw away no opportunity to do the master a mischief. But he kept ahead all the time. The retribution that followed every vengeful success was so sweeping and majestic that the boys always retired from the field badly worsted. At last they conspired together and hit upon a plan that promised a dazzling victory. (pp.109-10)

In describing the 'Examination' day itself, Twain does not squander the chance to satirize the hypocritical piety which pervades such occasions. As Sartorius notes in his objection, Twain is particularly dismissive of the sanctimonious 'compositions' offered by various female pupils:

A prevalent feature in these compositions was a nursed and petted melancholy; another was a wasteful and opulent gush of 'fine language'; another was a tendency to lug in by the ears particularly prized words and phrases until they were worn entirely out; and a peculiarity that conspicuously marked and marred them was the inveterate and intolerable sermon that wagged its crippled tail at the end of each and every one of them. No matter what the subject might be, a brain-racking effort was made to squirm it into some aspect or other that the moral and religious mind could contemplate with edification. The glaring insincerity of these sermons was not sufficient to compass banishment of the fashion from the schools, and it is not sufficient to-day; it never will be sufficient while the world stands, perhaps. There is no school in all our land where the young ladies do not feel obliged to close their compositions with a sermon; and you will find that the sermon of the most frivolous and least religious girl in the school is always the longest and the most relentlessly pious. (pp.111-12)

Here Twain is satirizing his society's tendency to consider education successful if its recipients are capable of merely parroting a certain pious discourse. He is also satirizing the pleasure adults take in placing children in situations in which they can be viewed conforming conspicuously to particular adult notions of childhood purity and goodness. It should be noted also that Twain explicitly makes the point that the hackneyed traditions he describes are not confined to Tom's school, but are a national scourge which he predicts may never be eradicated. The generalized character of Twain's attack on pious compositions may have made it appear even more subversive

to the Francoist censors, since it became an assault on a national tradition. Although the country in question was America, the notion of hypocritical bourgeois piety which underlies such traditions has a wider currency, and is certainly applicable to Francoist Spain.

Since the orthodox Francoist view of childhood, as exemplified in the school readers discussed in Chapter 1, incorporated a sanctimonious notion of their purity not dissimilar to the puritannical American version satirized by Twain, it is hardly surprising that Sartorius, and the authors of various other reports from this era (nos.34, 35, 37), specifically mentioned the portrayal of the school in this episode amongst their objections.

The section of this episode in which the teacher himself is openly ridiculed occurs at the end of Chapter 22 of *Tom Sawyer*. In an elaborate prank, Mr. Dobbins's head is painted gold whilst he is dozing tipsily before the 'Examination' evening. The boys then contrive to remove the master's wig whilst he is on stage, revealing his gilded pate, by lowering a cat through a skylight. Appreciably large sections of the audience clearly enjoy this diversion from the predictable events of the evening, suggesting a parallel with the episode in which Tom's pet beetle brings welcome relief from the monotony of the Sunday service. In both episodes, conventional rituals are disrupted by the mischief of children, and adults are seen to relish the chaotic consequences. As with the beetle episode, and in contrast to the incident involving the bible tickets, the perpetrators of the subversive act appear to go unpunished. Indeed, far from bringing misfortune in its wake, the conclusion of the chapter makes it clear that the boys derive considerable satisfaction from the success of the prank: 'That broke up the meeting. The boys were avenged. Vacation was come' (p.114).

The notion of children succeeding in an attempt to ridicule a figure in authority in order to achieve revenge clearly runs contrary to orthodox ideology. Once again, however, considerations of viewpoint raise questions regarding the censors' objections to this episode. Item 4(i) of the *Reglamento* established that '[se evitarán] los relatos en los que se ensalce la aparente bondad del niño que finge sumisión, o se condene la rebeldía del que se opone a la injusticia' (p.95, above). Since it is made clear that Mr. Dobbins is a sadistic tyrant, the boys' prank might conceivably be regarded as an act of rebellion against injustice. One could argue that by objecting to this scene,

therefore, the censors were technically contravening their own norms. It is clear that a little sadism and tyranny on the part of a schoolmaster was not considered sufficient 'injusticia' to overrule the more generally applicable injunction to exercise 'respeto a las personas que ejercen autoridad' (Item 2(g)). Given the reputation for brutality of traditional Spanish schoolteachers, this fact is hardly surprising.<sup>6</sup>

Interestingly, in the official report on Bruguera's edition of 1969 (no.40), in the 'infantil' category, the censor marked for suppression both the passage in which Mr. Dobbins's sadistic tendencies are described, and the description of the boys' revenge. As with the simultaneous objections to Protestantism and to Twain or Crompton's mockery of it, this is a clear instance of the censor wanting it both ways. It is probable that at least two other censors who objected to this episode, whose specific objections I have yet to identify precisely, were also uneasy with both Twain's pejorative portrait of Dobbins, and with the boys' ridiculing of their teacher, though logically these elements should have cancelled each other out. This certainly seems to be true in the case of the censor of the SRD edition (no.37), who labelled his objection to this episode 'ideas negativas y chacota respecto a la escuela y los maestros'. The term 'ideas negativas' is likely to correspond to Twain's unsympathetic portrayal of Dobbins, and the word 'chacota' presumably refers to the prank played on the teacher.

The censor of the Sopena edition of 1967 may also have had in mind the author's negative portrayal of Dobbins, as well as the ridicule he suffers at the hands of the boys, when he alluded to 'burla indiscriminada de una escuela y sus maestros' (no.35). The word 'indiscriminada' is unfairly used here, since it is surely no accident that the boys' prank is played on a teacher whose character has already been thoroughly undermined. Rather than being indiscriminate, Twain's satire, like much satire generally, is underpinned by a keen sense of moral discernment. Thus the most elaborately contrived and unredeemed state of ridicule in the novel is reserved precisely for the figure in authority who exercises that authority most irresponsibly, because he is mean-spirited and cruel. Clearly, the notion that any figure entrusted with such authority by a devout, God-fearing society might be portrayed in a children's work as tyrannical, vengeful and something of a drinker was an unpalatable one in itself, despite the foreign, Protestant setting of the work. This suggests that the



'injusticia' which children could legitimately oppose in a children's work had to come from a source which it was permissible to portray in a negative light.

Finally, with regard to this episode, it is worth remarking that the censors may well have felt that the educational ethos portrayed in *Tom Sawyer* shared more points of similarity with Francoist pedagogy than the educational ethos of the *William* books. The greater identification of religious piety with pedagogy is a particularly striking common feature of Tom's school and a typical Francoist school. Tom's school is also founded on far more authoritarian pedagogical principles than William's. This may have led the censors to feel that Tom's school was more similar to a Francoist school, and that mockery of it was therefore less tolerable. The far more libertarian institution of the *William* books - William at one point recalls its atmosphere of 'sencilla licenciosidad' (*Guillermo artista de cine* (no.24), p.110) - may have been considered so manifestly dissimilar to the Francoist school that criticism of it was felt to be unimportant. The fact that the censors objected to the portrayal of Dobbins is generally indicative of the urge to suppress allusions to tyrannical authority in children's books, but it may also reflect the fear that Spanish children might recognize the portrait of Mr. Dobbins from their own experiences at school. The regime's more general bad conscience concerning its own tyrannical methods may well have contributed to the censors' unease regarding this passage: as Twain remarks after his indictment of the sanctimonious educational ethos, 'homely truths are unpalatable' (*Tom Sawyer*, p.112).

#### (ii) The police

Turning now to attacks on other figures in authority, it is worth noting that in his particularly detailed criticism of Juventud's 1966 edition, Sartorius objected to a pejorative allusion to the police. The censor was referring to the following passage in *Tom Sawyer*, which occurs after Injun Joe has fled the courthouse:

Rewards had been offered, the country had been scoured, but no Injun Joe had been found. One of those omniscient and awe-inspiring marvels, a detective, came up from St. Louis, moused around, shook his head, looked wise, and made that sort of astounding success which members of that craft usually achieve. That is to say, 'he found a clew.' But you can't hang a 'clew' for murder, and so after that detective had got through and gone home, Tom felt just as insecure as he was before. (p.123)

This passage was not considered objectionable by any other censor, nor indeed was it mentioned by Sartorius himself in other reports. If this tends to demonstrate anything other than the arbitrariness inherent in the system, it is that Sartorius was a particularly staunch opponent of *Tom Sawyer*, and that his opposition was especially vehement in the case of Juventud's 1966 edition. Further collation of editions is required in order to establish whether other editions of the period do in fact contain this allusion to the detective, which can hardly be described as generally critical of the forces of law and order, since it is not at all clear whether the ineffectual figure described by Twain is part of an institutional power (the police force), or merely a private investigator.<sup>7</sup>

The *Catálogo crítico* of 1967 provides evidence that whilst criticism of the police force in a children's book was generally tolerated by the official censors, it was nevertheless considered a dubious characteristic. The entry on Enid Blyton's *Misterio de los mensajes sorprendentes*, published by the Editorial Molino, includes the observation that 'los fracasos del policía, en toda la obra escarnecido, están muy exagerados' (p.151). Similarly, the entry on Blyton's *El misterio del cuadro robado* reads as follows: 'Una pandilla de niños logra descubrir a los ladrones de una valiosa pintura. La torpeza del policía del pueblo pone de relieve la actuación de los chicos. [...] Deja malparado al policía' (p.151).

It is of course possible, not to say probable, that portrayals of incompetent *Spanish* policemen would not have been viewed with equal tolerance by the official censors. Consultation of censorship documents relating to a children's work containing such a figure might clarify this point. If such a work exists, however, it would be likely to predate the Franco era, since no Spanish author is likely to have thought it advisable to include mockery of the Spanish police in a work submitted to the children's censorship body. Unfortunately, neither is it likely that a Spanish publisher would decide to submit such a work for censorship, even if it did exist. Given Quintana's remarks on the similarity of content between the *William* books and Elena Fortún's *Celia* series (p.123), however, it is possible that these latter might prove to be a suitable analogue with regard to the censor's response to portrayals of subversion generally in autochthonous works.

### (iii) Political figures

Thus far, we have examined the censors' responses to portrayals of teachers and the police in the two works. Both *Tom Sawyer* and the *William* books also contain allusions to figures whose authority can be categorized, broadly, as political. At the beginning of Chapter 5 of *Tom Sawyer*, for example, various local figures are described arriving at the church. One couple is identified as 'the mayor and his wife - for they had a mayor there, among other unnecessaries' (p.27). Perhaps surprisingly, I have so far discovered only two instances of official suppression of Twain's sardonic aside here. The suppression of this remark was ordered by the censor, or censors, of the Paulinas and Rodas editions, both submitted in 1974.<sup>8</sup> This is somewhat surprising in the light of the substitutions carried out in *Guillermo el organizador* (no.8), which suggested that mockery of the mayor was considered (at least by the publishers) to be a more tolerable alternative to ridicule of the vicar (p.177, above).

On the face of it, this would seem to suggest that assaults on the dignity of the mayor in a children's book were no more acceptable, or even less so, in 1974 than they had been in 1943.<sup>9</sup> It is possible, however, that Twain's remark was viewed as particularly subversive because it was a direct judgement of mayors generally, expressed with the authoritative voice of the narrator. The modified *William* proofs, on the other hand, merely *showed* a mayor suffering the consequences of a prank played on his guest (the bishop/minister), a situation which does not directly reflect badly on the mayor himself, or on mayors generally. Nevertheless, the fact that an entire chapter in which a child is shown playing a prank on the mayor should be thought tolerable in 1943, and yet Twain's terse aside was suppressed in 1974, exemplifies both the continuing vigilance of the censors in the area of children's literature, and the dramatic effects, in terms of additional censorship rigour, of *Tom Sawyer's* relegation from Classic novel status.

Ascending the political hierarchy, we find that an allusion to the institution of monarchy was also suppressed in the Paulinas and Rodas editions. In the scene in question, the curate is described offering a prayer which consists of a catalogue of supplications on behalf of various groups, one of which is 'the oppressed millions groaning under the heel of European monarchies and oriental despotisms' (*Tom Sawyer*, p.29). In the Rodas proofs, this allusion is marked for suppression in the

following fashion: '[Pidió] por los millones de oprimidos que gimen bajo el talón de las monarquías europeas y de los déspotas orientales' (underlined as in proofs, p.35). In the case of the Paulinas edition, the phrase I have italicized is marked for suppression by single underlining: '[Pedía] por los millones de seres oprimidos que gimen bajo el *yugo de las monarquías europeas y el despotismo oriental*' (p.42).

Quite why the pejorative allusion to oriental despots was underlined at all in the Rodas edition cannot now be known, though it may be that the censor found the entire sentence excessively political for a children's book. An alternative interpretation is that a derogatory allusion to autocratic rule was felt to be an objectionable instance of democratic propaganda.

The censors' objection to the implied similarity between oriental despotism and the European monarchies is rather more easily comprehensible. It is perhaps significant, however, that these are the only two editions, of those thus far examined in any detail, from which this allusion was excised. This may reflect the increasing sensitivity of the regime to attacks on the institution of the monarchy, motivated by Franco's public nomination of Juan Carlos as his successor in July 1969 (*Franco*, p.742). Alternatively, it may emerge that the publishers had already omitted this allusion from previous editions submitted during the later era, deeming it to be inappropriate in a children's work, or fearing that it might provoke official objection. However this allusion was treated by publishers or censors in other cases, the fact that it was definitely suppressed from two editions during the period in office of Pío Cabanillas suggests continued attention to the defence of cherished institutions in children's literature, despite the overall liberalization of censorship in this period.

With regard to representations of the monarchy in children's literature, it is worth recording that the censor of the 1967 Sopena edition of *Huckleberry Finn* (Appendix C, no.6) objected to Huck's attack on the general character of monarchs in Chapter 23 of the novel, calling it '[un] ataque a la autoridad representada en los reyes'. The passage alluded to by the censor begins with Jim's observation that 'dese kings o' ourn is regular rapscllions' (p.316). Huck replies that 'all kings is mostly rapscllions, as fur as I can make out' (translated as 'la mayoría de los reyes son unos maleantes' in the Sopena edition, p.192). Huck then launches into a confused account of the life of Henry VIII and various other monarchs, freely eliding disparate strands

of historical knowledge he has picked up from his intermittent education. He concludes with the pronouncement that: 'Kings is kings, and you got to make allowances. Take them all round, they're a mighty ornery lot. It's the way they're raised' (p.317).

This indictment of monarchs generally would no doubt have been considered especially irreverent because it was made by Huck. This is because Huck is a child, but here displays a distinctly unorthodox lack of awe towards monarchs, and therefore towards authority. Furthermore, he is a sympathetic character, and his judgements could thus be viewed as implicitly consonant with those of the author. This interpretation of course ignores the immense irony of Huck's final remark, which shows the destitute son of a drunkard excusing the ignoble behaviour of the aristocracy on the grounds of 'the way they're raised'.

Turning now to the representation of political personages in the *William* books, we find that Crompton's frequent allusions to dictators, particularly Hitler, were not suppressed or identified as objectionable by the censors. In *Guillermo amaestrador de perros* (no.23), for example, the reader is introduced to a gardener who is 'una mezcla de Hitler, Mussolini, Herodes y Napoleón' (p.114). In *Guillermo artista de cine* (no.24), the domineering female character Arabella is at one point described as having 'un brillo hitleriano en los ojos' (p.15). In the same work, there are two other references to Hitler (p.147 and p.255). The latter allusion is made by Queenie Lane, who exclaims of William '¡se ha hecho el dueño de nuestra banda como si fuera Hitler o alguien!'. Later, she fulminates against William in similar fashion: '¡Y cómo se comporta! [...] ¡Cualquiera diría que es uno del eje!' (p.262).

At an earlier stage of William's power struggle against Queenie, we learn that 'Guillermo trató de conservar el aire de jefe de aquel estado totalitario' (p.260), and in the previous chapter, William at one point assumes 'un aire de dictador' (p.198). Finally, in *Guillermo el superhombre* (no.34), William and his Outlaws build an 'Ark', having predicted that a second Great Flood is approaching. Arabella protests at William's refusal to allow her and her cohorts to enter the 'Ark' with the question '¿Quién eres tú para impedirnoslo? ¿Noé? ¿Hitler?' (p.13).

All of these references occur in translations published after the era of *William's* effective prohibition. Since the end of the Second World War was already thirteen

years in the past when *William's* second epoch began in Spain, and the regime had for a long time been publicly distancing itself from its ideological progenitors Nazism and Fascism, it is perhaps not surprising that these allusions were not considered objectionable. It seems that allusions of a somewhat disparaging nature to Hitler and Mussolini were permitted both in books for adults and in those for children, but that Franco must not be compared to the two defeated autocrats. This norm is suggested by the report on André Philipe's *La Izquierda: Mitos y Realidades*, submitted for censorship by the Editorial Estela in December 1965 (8520-65/16795). The censor's sole objection to the work was that it contained 'una apreciación injustificada al citar a Franco como pseudo-revolucionario al modo de Hitler y Mussolini'. The censor stipulated that the words 'y Franco' should be suppressed in the following phrase: 'Son Hitler, Mussolini y Franco quienes han hecho pseudo-revoluciones'. It is of course ironical that comparison of Franco to Hitler and Mussolini was latterly proscribed, in the light of Franco's strenuous efforts to be identified with them during the years of Axis dominance (*Franco*, pp.249, 329).

Returning to the *William* books, it is also possible that the censors may have felt that the allusions to dictators were not especially derogatory, particularly in cases where William himself is referred to as behaving in dictatorial fashion. Whilst there is clearly a large degree of fond mockery aimed at William's vanity in such references, William's dictatorial tendencies are also consistent with his self-confidence, enterprising spirit and capacity to influence others. Since William is the hero - however ambivalent - of the series, comparisons of him to dictators may thus have been thought of as positive features. Any attendant ironies were evidently too subtle to undermine this opinion, if indeed the censors held it.

On the other hand, several of the allusions cited would seem to contravene the prohibition on exaltation of 'cualquier emulación o estímulo que pueda suscitar [...] culto desproporcionado y ambicioso de la propia personalidad' in children's books (*Estatuto*, Section 9(d)). Given the ambivalence surrounding possible interpretations of these allusions, it would be revealing to ascertain whether any Spanish author, particularly of children's literature, ever referred to the Axis dictators in a similarly jocular fashion to the *William* books, and how such allusions were treated by the censors in different epochs.

In the specific case of *William*, it is most likely that by 1962, when most of the allusions to dictators were published, the censors had simply become convinced that the series was ultimately innocuous and that they were thus persuaded to tolerate a higher quantity of dubious or subversive content in individual works by virtue of the positive precedent accumulated by the series overall.<sup>10</sup> The regime's growing conviction that many of the *William* books were ultimately harmless is exemplified in the 1967 *Catálogo crítico* entry on *Guillermo amaestrador de perros*: 'Aunque no resulta una obra precisamente aleccionadora, carece de reparos graves, pues los éxitos de las travesuras de Guillermo no tienen más intención que la de producir un efecto cómico' (p.103).

Political content in the *William* books is not limited to passing allusions to dictators, however. *Guillermo el malo* (no.10) contains an entire chapter in which William and the Outlaws hold a general election, each adopting the role of leader of a political party. It is made clear at the beginning of the chapter that the children are not generally interested in political matters:

La elección general era un tópico propio de las personas mayores; conversaban de él como del tiempo y del precio del petróleo. [Pelirrojo] daba por sentado que sería tan aburrido como los otros. Pero lo había oído repetir últimamente tantas veces, que sentía una vaga curiosidad. (Typed proofs, p.41)

The Outlaws, and especially William, nonetheless glimpse some potential for entertainment in the idea of an election when Henry informs them that it involves making speeches in public. The next step is to choose their respective party allegiances. Henry again enlightens them with his knowledge of political matters, summarizing the democratic political system thus:

Cuatro clases de personas desean ser gobernantes. Todas quieren mejorar las cosas, pero cada una de un modo distinto. Los conservadores piensan mejorarlas dejándolas tal como están ahora. Los liberales desean mejorarlas cambiándolas un poco, sin que nadie lo note, los socialistas las mejorarán quitando el dinero a todo el mundo y los comunistas matando a los demás, menos a ellos mismos. Hacen que les voten, y quien tiene más votos gana, y su jefe se llama Primer Ministro y dice al rey lo que debe hacer. (p.42)

The narrative then turns to the process by which William chooses his party. He immediately rejects the liberals because his elder brother Robert is one. He then decides he will pledge allegiance to whichever party is supported by a certain Mr. Martin, a big game hunter who has just visited the Brown household, thus becoming

William's latest role model. Though it is made clear that William is not naturally inclined towards the Communists, he has to entertain the possibility that he will be obliged to join them if it turns out that Mr. Martin is one: 'Si el señor Martín lo era, Guillermo acallaría su natural repugnancia a matar a sus semejantes y combatiría las posibles aspiraciones de Pelirrojo a la jefatura del partido comunista' (p.45).<sup>11</sup> Mr. Martin turns out to be a Conservative.

A large crowd gathers to hear the rival candidates make their cases for being 'Prime Minister' of the locality. Again, it is made clear that the children's interest in the event has nothing to do with any political curiosity or awareness on their part: 'Desde luego, la población infantil del lugar no sentía interés por la política. Pero cualquier acto público, organizado por Guillermo y sus Proscritos, prometía emociones sin cuento y nadie quiso desaprovechar la ocasión de sentirlas' (p.46).

Speaking first, Douglas promises all those prepared to vote for him an invitation to his birthday party, the delights of which he describes in some detail. The narrator remarks that 'Douglas tenía madera de político. No le importaba lo que prometía' (p.47).

Henry then speaks as the Socialist candidate. Interestingly, his definition of socialism has been modified in the proofs. The original type-written text reads 'el socialismo es quitar el dinero a los demás'. The word 'quitar' has been crossed out and replaced in ink with the word 'repartir'. This renders his following remark somewhat nonsensical: 'Seríamos mucho más ricos si tuviésemos el dinero de los demás y el nuestro' (p.49).<sup>12</sup>

A boy notorious for winning a Sunday school diploma points out that Henry's ideology advocates robbery, a sin. Henry replies: 'Sí, es un pecado. Pero no se roba cuando lo permite la ley. [...] Nosotros lo haremos legalmente' (p.49). Later, the star of the Sunday school challenges Ginger's Communist aspiration to kill all non-Communists, pointing out that 'matar es pecado'. Ginger replies: 'Pero no si matan en la guerra' (p.51).

Naturally, William wins the election, spellbinding his audience by recounting the heroic feats of Mr. Martin, whom he reveals to be a Conservative at the climax of his speech. Crompton's satirical portrait of the democratic process continues after William has become 'Prime Minister'. William's dictatorial tendencies are again



evident when he is asked by a member of his juvenile electorate what will be his first act of public service as Prime Minister. He replies: 'No pienso hacer nada para vosotros. Voy a *gobernar*' (emphasis as in proofs, p.54).

William then pledges to the people that he will recover for public use a tadpole pond which has been appropriated by a Miss Dalrymple. Ginger and Henry offer their assistance, But William responds: 'Sois mis adversarios y tendríais que impedirlo, aunque lo queráis. Deberíais oponeros. Es una de las reglas' (p.55).

Aspects of this episode might conceivably be viewed as contravening Item 3(b) of the *Reglamento*, which proscribed 'los relatos que presenten a una luz favorable las reacciones antisociales [...] porque den de lo social una versión tendenciosa y errónea, a base de 'grupos o partidas' en que se acumulan los instintos vindicativos de sus componentes' (Cendán Pazos, p.58). Ginger and Henry's respective defences of robbery and murder in the service of left-wing ideology, however satirically intended, might have been thought especially misleading to children.

It is clear that the overwhelming effect of this episode as a whole, however, is to satirize the failings of democracy as it is exercised in practice. That the episode was permitted by the censors thus suggests that they could identify irony or satire when it suited them. Several specific features may also have been considered mitigating by the censors. Firstly, the degree of actual interest in politics on the part of both the adult and juvenile populations is dismissed as either trivial or non-existent. The children's habitual rejection of politics as an 'adult' matter is alluded to on more than one occasion. As an adult concern it is ranked merely as a suitable topic of polite conversation, comparable with the weather. This belittling of politics as a rather dull, irrelevant business which adults tiresomely insist on discussing is paralleled in the following passage from *Guillermo el gángster* (no.16):

A intervalos frecuentes visitaban la escuela diversos conferenciantes para interesar a los jóvenes sobre ideas como la Situación Política (desde un ángulo completamente imparcial), la Fabricación del Jabón (o galletas, papel secante, tejidos o aeroplanos), las Costumbres de los Pájaros, las Maravillas de las Profundidades, Colecciones de Flores Silvestres, y otros temas, ante los que Guillermo hacía el sordo. (p.145)

Here politics is portrayed as a kind of bourgeois adult pastime, as tedious as any other for the likes of William. This view of politics accords to some extent with the orthodox ideological scheme, according to which an excessive interest in politics

was an unhealthy preoccupation, not to be indulged in by patriotic members of the population (see note 11, Chapter 1, above).

Secondly, the fact that William wins the elections on the Conservative ticket, however absurdly, may have been considered a redeeming feature of the episode. William's readiness to become a murderous Communist if it emerged that Mr. Martin was one may have been thought excusable on account of the protagonist's impressionable age. It nonetheless seems remarkable that a child's willingness to become a Communist merely to emulate a charismatic adult was not considered dangerously misleading by the censors. The fact that the phlegmatic, big-game hunting Mr. Martin in fact turned out to be Conservative no doubt fitted the orthodox conception of such men, however, and may have ultimately been thought to override William's misguided speculation regarding his hero's political affiliations.

Finally, although Crompton satirically describes the Conservatives as the party who want to improve things by keeping them the way they are, this charge of complacency does not compare with the indictment of the left-wing parties, whose methods are portrayed, superficially at least, as blatantly immoral. The stigmatization of Socialists as thieves, and of Communists as murderers, accords entirely with orthodox ideology. The entire episode thus simultaneously tends to ridicule the democratic process and demonize left-wing ideology.

Despite these positive features, according to the orthodox ideological scheme, it is nevertheless worth noting that neither the official censor nor the author of the entry on *Guillermo el malo* in the *Catálogo crítico* mentioned the political content of the work, which was classified in the *Catálogo* as being suitable for nine- to twelve-year-olds (*Catálogo*, 1961, p.115). This fact tends to suggest that portrayals of political factionalism and partisanship in a children's work were considered acceptable, at least if they could be construed as reflecting negatively on the democratic political system, and if they applied to countries other than Spain. Comparison with other political allusions in children's books would be required to establish fully the veracity of this suggestion, and to determine to what extent the orthodox response depended on the foreign setting, the nature of the portrayal itself, and the prestige and precedent of the work or series in which it appeared.

A further factor to be borne in mind, as always, is the era in which the work was submitted. *William the Bad* was first published in English in March 1930. One suspects that the censorship response would have been radically different had the translation been submitted at the end of the 1930s or at any time during the 1940s.<sup>13</sup>

## Part II: Nation and Race

### (i) Patriotism

It will be recalled that love of country was classified in Item 2(g) of the *Reglamento* as one of the sacrosanct values which could not be treated irreverently in children's books. Item 4(c) reinforced this defence of patriotic values, proscribing 'cuanto atente contra los valores que inspiran la tradición, la historia y la vida española'. As suggested in Chapter 1 considerations of viewpoint raise intriguing questions with regard to Item 2(g) in particular. There is no sure way of telling from this Item, or from orthodox propaganda texts, how the censors might have responded to satirical portrayals of patriotism in which the image of Spain itself was not at stake. Such portrayals are discussed below. We shall turn first, however, to the less complicated matter of the censor's response to allusions in which Spain itself is mentioned in children's literature.

It would seem reasonable to infer from Item 4(c) that all negative allusions to Spain itself in children's books would have been considered proscribable. The censor's report on Emilio Salgari's *Últimas aventuras del corsario negro*, submitted by Ediciones Marisal in November 1942 (6-864/7036), provides evidence that such allusions were indeed suppressed, at least in the earlier period. The censor ordered that the following passage should be excised from the text:

-¿Los aliados?- comentó el Ministro Bogino. -¿La experiencia no os enseña nada? ¿Cuántas veces la Emperatriz María Teresa ha faltado a su palabra? ¡Los austriacos no han dado mejores pruebas que los franceses y los españoles, en cuanto a defecciones y traiciones! (p.269)

Turning to the principal texts of this dissertation, *Tom Sawyer* contains one clear instance of an allusion to Spain which might have been considered derogatory, though in a less direct and less general fashion than the above example from Salgari. The allusion concerns the 'old deaf and dumb Spaniard' who is seen about St. Petersburg and turns out to be the fugitive Injun Joe in disguise (p.131). This phantom

Spaniard is mentioned by Huck, who tells Tom he has had nightmares 'with that patch-eyed Spanish devil going for me all through 'em' (p.137). The matter of whether this latter allusion reflects badly on Spain is complicated, since both Huck and the reader know that the 'Spaniard' is in fact Injun Joe, and not a Spaniard at all.

In the 1957 Mateu edition (no.19), the Spaniard is changed to a Mexican (pp.122, 127). In the Salvat and Aguilar editions he remains a Spaniard (Salvat (no.42) pp.139, 145; Aguilar (no.9) pp.242, 253). This might seem to reflect the fact that the presentation of the Mateu edition suggests that it was intended to appeal to a younger readership as well as to adults. The publishers might thus be expected to have felt it prudent to err on the side of caution with regard to this allusion, though such a policy is not generally reflected in the Mateu edition.

Whatever the reason for this modification, the fact that the publishers felt that it was necessary in an edition published before the era of additional rigour against *Tom Sawyer* is noteworthy. It suggests that later editions of the work which were considered to be specifically intended for children may have employed a similar strategy. Further consultation of such editions would be required in order to confirm whether this was the case, or whether the censors credited young readers with sufficient discernment to realize that the Spanish nation was not necessarily maligned because a fugitive criminal chose to disguise himself as a Spaniard.<sup>14</sup>

Whilst I have as yet discovered no direct allusion to Spain in the *William* books, pejorative or otherwise, they contain various scenes in which William embarks on enterprises motivated by patriotic sentiment. The question of how the censors responded to patriotism on the part of non-Spanish characters can thus be addressed. In *Guillermo el bueno* (no.9), for example, William recruits a juvenile army and tells them that: 'Eso es lo que hemos de hacer nosotros. Salvar a nuestra nación de los enemigos extranjeros' (typed proofs, p.64). William then convinces his 'subordinates' that a real military unit on manoeuvres in the area is in fact an invading enemy force. William charges another boy with the mission of stealing the enemy's invasion plans. This episode is recounted as follows:

El General Bristow, caminando tranquilamente por la carretera mientras estudiaba su mapa, vio con sorpresa como salía de la cuneta un muchacho ... y un momento más tarde su sorpresa se hizo mayor al recibir un cabezazo en pleno estómago que le dejó sentado sobre el polvo. Por unos instantes el dolor

no le dejó ver más allá del ultraje que aquél niño malvado había cometido contra sus órganos digestivos. Luego su visión se fue aclarando, y pudo ver que su mapa había desaparecido y que el muchacho se alejaba por el horizonte. [...] Con un grito de rabia se largó en persecución de su agresor, más por su afán de venganza que por el deseo de recuperar el mapa (del que tenía otras copias). (p.76)

Needless to say William's efforts are not appreciated by the adult community, and he is upbraided by his father (p.89). This episode thus shows juvenile patriotism being punished rather than rewarded. Furthermore, the attack on General Bristow, however well-intentioned, superficially portrays a child physically assaulting a military figure of authority, who is then described as harbouring vengeful sentiments towards his attacker. The episode as a whole thus seems to contravene the orthodox scheme in various respects.

The evidence of the William books thus suggests that mockery of patriotic enterprises, even if these were sincerely undertaken, was considered acceptable. It may well be significant, however, that the blundering patriots described in the series are of course not Spanish. Moreover, the fact that the misguided patriotic enterprises are undertaken in the service of a power, England, to which the regime was ideologically opposed during the Second World War, and which was one of the historical enemies of Francoist propaganda, may have been felt to undercut any unexemplary features. It is hard to imagine that the censors would not have reacted disapprovingly to the following description of Robert's role in the war, for example, had it been applied to a Spanish character:

Salía espléndido y marcial con su casco y su máscara antigás, y pasaba sus buenas ocho horas leyendo novelas policíacas o jugando a diversos juegos con el resto de sus compañeros. En este servicio a su patria estaba adquiriendo una gran técnica en ajedrez y ya había aprendido varios 'solitarios' nuevos.<sup>15</sup>

It is also important to note the time elapsed between the publication of the original works in which satirical descriptions of patriotism appear, and the appearance of their corresponding translations. The majority of these works were originally published during the Second World War (see note 15), whilst *William the Good* dates from 1928. The fact that Molino did not even begin to submit these works for censorship until the late 1950s (and some were submitted much later than this) may well indicate that doing so at an earlier juncture was considered inadvisable. Certainly, one suspects that had these works been translated and submitted in the mid- or late

1940s, for example, when the regime's affiliation to the Axis was still a recent memory, the censor's response to representations of patriotism shown towards an Allied power may well have been rather different.

In comparison to the *William* books, *Tom Sawyer* contains relatively few allusions to sentiments or enterprises which can be considered either openly patriotic or blatantly unpatriotic. Nevertheless, the *Catálogo crítico* (1961) objected to Twain's 'ironías sobre todo lo instituido' (p.178), suggesting that the fact that American institutions were the target of these ironies was not felt to excuse them fully. Despite this general unease, however, arguably pejorative or unpatriotic allusions to specific political figures were never cited as objectionable characteristics of *Tom Sawyer*. At the end of Chapter 8, for example, there is a passage in which Tom and Joe are described enacting scenes from the legend of Robin Hood. The passage and the chapter conclude with the following sentence: 'They said they would rather be outlaws a year in Sherwood Forest than President of the United States for ever' (p.51). The extent to which this allusion can be considered pejorative or truly unpatriotic is debatable. Had Twain written 'the King of Spain' instead of 'the President of the United States', however, one can imagine that the sentiment expressed by the boys here would have been deemed unacceptable in a work for children.

The fact that this allusion was apparently never suppressed tends to suggest, as did the unsuppressed allusions to dictators in the *William* books, that derisive or flippant allusions to non-Spanish political leaders were not considered objectionable in a children's work.<sup>16</sup> The allusions to dictators in the *William* books, however, imply no lack of patriotism on the part of the children who made them (in some cases rather the opposite). Tom and Joe's preference for being outlaws rather than the head of state of their own nation might conceivably suggest, on the other hand, at least an undervaluing of the office, and therefore, though very indirectly, a lack of patriotic ardour.

It is interesting to consider this unsuppressed reference to the President alongside Huck's remarks on the monarchy, which were considered objectionable by the censor of the Sopena edition of *Huckleberry Finn* (p.247, above). All of the examples used by Huck concern English and French monarchs, and his most vehement obloquy is directed at Henry VIII. His criticism thus centres principally on figures

reviled according to the National-Catholic world view.<sup>17</sup> Despite this, at least one censor considered the passage objectionable, no doubt because Huck explicitly extrapolates his remarks to the general case, thus directly attacking an institution (the monarchy) latterly held dear by the Franco regime. As remarked above, the general character of the allusion to mayors as superfluous was also probably the reason for its suppression (p.246, above). In the case of the remark concerning the President on the other hand, there is no such extrapolation, so that only the specific office is arguably belittled. This feature, along with the fact that any sense of denigration is very indirect, may explain why this allusion was never deemed objectionable.

One might thus tentatively posit a theory regarding allusions to non-Spanish political figures in children's books: all such allusions were considered acceptable, even if they tended to deride former allies of Spain (as in the case of the references to Hitler), and even if they tended to portray children behaving or thinking unpatriotically. Scathing allusions to the *general concept* of political authority, or to the offices in which such authority is vested, could sometimes be considered proscribable, especially if the censor disapproved of the overall character of the work. Clearly, a great deal more evidence would be required in order to test this theory, and it is likely that factors such as the precedent of individual works and the moment at which they were submitted will be found to intersect with this scheme to a significant degree.

## (ii) Racism

Related to the question of nationality and patriotism in children's books is the matter of race. We have already seen in Chapter 1 how Francoist propaganda was somewhat ambivalent with regard to this matter, occasionally borrowing anti-Semitic Nazi rhetoric, but also including somewhat surprising allusions to the brotherhood of all men (see note 9, Chapter 1).

Perhaps equally surprising is the discovery that the Francoist censors objected to racist allusions in children's books on several occasions during the later period. In the Rodas edition of *Tom Sawyer*, for example, the following phrase was marked in the initial copy, and omitted from the final version: 'No he conocido a un negro que no mienta' (p.42). Further investigation would be required to establish whether this

allusion was suppressed or modified in other children's editions of *Tom Sawyer* in Spain. It is rendered without modification in the editions of Aguilar (no.9; pp.74, 275), Salvat (no.42; pp.44, 158) and Mateu (no.19; pp.40, 137).

Orthodox responses to other works suggest that objections to racist allusions in children's literature were not uncommon, at least in the later Francoist era. The censor of the 1967 Sopena edition of *Huck Finn* (Appendix C, no.6) objected to '[una] explosión racista a cargo de un borracho'. The censor was undoubtedly referring to a harangue delivered by Huck's father, in which he fulminates against 'a free nigger [...] from Ohio', who was 'a p'fessor in a college, and could talk all kinds of languages, and knowed everything'. Huck's father then begins to rail against the Ohio State government for allowing the sage in question to get ideas above his station. His rant concludes as follows:

'There, now - that's a specimen. They call that a govment that can't sell a free nigger till he's been in the State six months. Here's a govment that calls itself a govment, and lets on to be a govment, and thinks it is a govment, and yet's got to set stock-still for six whole months before it can take ahold of a prowling, thieving, infernal, white-shirted free nigger, and -'

Pap was agoing on so, he never noticed where his old limber legs was taking him to, so he went head over heels over the tub of salt pork, and barked both shins, and the rest of his speech was all the hottest kind of language - mostly hove at the nigger and the govment, though he give the tubs some, too, all along, here and there. (pp.207-08)

Once again, the censor's inability or unwillingness to take into account considerations of point of view in works for children is revealed. By the time Mr. Finn makes this speech, it is quite clear from the preceding narrative that he is a cruel and irresponsible character. He has kidnapped his son from the benign custody of Widow Douglas and stowed him away in a secluded cabin, where he beats him and leaves him shut in alone for days at a time. The narrative thus not only tends to invalidate his opinions, it has the effect of holding them up for ridicule as the prejudices of a drunken, inadequate misfit. Had the censor paid more attention to what the narrative implicitly *shows*, rather than to what a character within it explicitly *says*, s/he would have realized that racism tends to be condemned, not promoted, by the account of Mr. Finn's rant. The inclusion of the words 'racista' and 'borracho' in the censor's report tend to suggest that this is in fact another instance of wanting it both ways: although the racist sentiments are undermined because they are expressed by a drunkard, the



censor clearly wishes to object to *both* the presence of drunkenness and racism in a work for children, thus failing or refusing to see that both are implicitly condemned by the way the narrative is structured.

As with Huck's declarations on marriage in *Tom Sawyer* (see pp.197-98, above), the censor's objection to this passage tends to suggest that attendant ironies and considerations of viewpoint were not generally considered sufficient mitigation in cases where unacceptable views were blatantly expressed in children's books. Unlike the case of Huck's negative response to Tom's matrimonial plans, however, it is somewhat surprising to find that racist sentiments were considered objectionable at all, in the light of the general character of the regime.

Nevertheless, the *Catálogo crítico* provides further evidence that portrayals of racial prejudice in children's books were an orthodox preoccupation, at least in the later period. Mateu's version of *Huckleberry Finn*, for example, was criticized in the 1961 *Catálogo*, though on different grounds to those cited by the official censor of the Sopena edition.<sup>18</sup> The author of the entry observed that 'el relato de las riñas y venganzas de unos granjeros, la figura poco ejemplar del padre de Huck y la aventura final en la que Tom hace sufrir a un negro inútilmente, hacen que este libro no sea conveniente para niños' (p.178).

Whilst it is Tom's alleged callousness which is at the root of the compiler's objection here, the fact that the victim is a black man seems to be important also. In the adventure in question, Tom contrives an elaborate scheme to 'free' Jim from the captivity of Silas Phelps, despite the fact that he knows the 'runaway' to have been liberated already in his Aunt's will. The censor's criticism thus seems legitimate from a humanitarian standpoint: Jim is confined in harsh conditions for some considerable time, despite the fact that a word from Tom might set him free. Tom postpones the revelation of his knowledge merely because he wishes to experience the thrill of adventure by assisting Jim's 'escape'.

The subtlety of Twain's portrait of period and characterization is exemplified by the attitude of both Tom and Huck to Jim: both respect him as an honest and loyal friend, but equally neither can help but view him as a 'nigger'. Neither child seriously questions the institution of slavery generally, and Huck particularly has pangs of conscience concerning his aiding and abetting of Jim's escape, despite his fondness for

the slave, because his environment has taught him that his actions are wrong. In Chapter 31, for example, Huck considers giving Jim away, but rejects the idea because he cannot bear the thought of the reprisals the runaway might suffer. He also considers his own predicament:

And then think of *me*! It would get all around that Huck Finn helped a nigger to get his freedom; and if I was ever to see anybody from that town again, I'd be ready to get down and lick his boots for shame. That's just the way; a person does a low-down thing, and then he don't want to take no consequences of it. Thinks as long as he can hide it, it ain't no disgrace. That was my fix exactly. The more I studied about this, the more my conscience went to grinding me, and the more wicked and low-down and ornery I got to feeling. [...] Well, I tried the best I could to kinder soften it up somehow for myself, by saying I was brung up wicked, and so I warn't so much to blame; but something inside of me kept saying, 'There was the Sunday school, you could a gone to it; and if you'd a done it they'd a learnt you, there, that people that acts as I'd been acting about that nigger goes to everlasting fire'. (pp.366-67)

Tom's insensitivity to Jim's confinement undoubtedly stems largely from his youthful lust for adventure, but his failure to ask himself whether he might not be acting somewhat inhumanely by prolonging Jim's captivity reflects principally on the society which has moulded him. In that society, a black man's freedom was in the gift of his owner, and was bestowed as an act of supreme magnanimity. The black man had no cause to complain, it seems, if his owner's nephew chose to prolong his bondage for the sake of a little adventure.

It is of course arguable whether children are capable of adopting sufficient critical distance to understand that the assumptions and prejudices of an earlier age are not necessarily to be taken at face value in a literary work. With regard to the racial attitudes in *Huckleberry Finn*, this point is still debated today. The question is particularly fraught in the case of the original work, because of the high incidence of the word 'nigger', rendered as the much more neutral 'negro' in Spanish translations. Objections to the portrayal of racial prejudice and stereotyping - whether made by a Francoist bibliographer or a radical academic at the end of the twentieth century - tend to reflect the view that children are *not* capable of understanding cultural differences of this kind. Whatever one's views on the validity of such objections, however, the compiler's scruples with regard to Tom's treatment of Jim seem to strike an uncharacteristically enlightened, or at least humane, note in comparison to orthodox judgements on children's literature generally.

An entry in the 1967 *Catálogo*, on Twain's *El detective distraído*, demonstrates that orthodox discomfort with portrayals of racial prejudice was not confined to Twain's masterworks.<sup>19</sup> The entry also suggests, however, that such portrayals were not necessarily felt to undermine the overall positive character of a work: 'Instructivo, con algún prejuicio racial propio de la época en que se escribió la obra' (p.156).

The surprising evidence for a preoccupation with racial equality in children's books on the part of the Francoist censors suggests that this is an area in which further study might prove revealing. The censors' response to portrayals of racial prejudice is likely to have evolved significantly as a function of the regime's overall evolution. All of the reservations concerning portrayals of racial prejudice discussed above were expressed in the later period. It is unlikely that the censors were quite so concerned with avoiding prejudicial portrayals in the early 1940s, for example, at a time when Franco was composing his film script *Raza*, and the authors of regime propaganda were borrowing some of the anti-Semitic discourse of Nazism.

Various factors nonetheless militate in favour of the theory that Francoism may have espoused a more egalitarian approach to race than Nazism. One was its sense of ownership over its racially mixed former empire in the Americas and North Africa, which may have given rise to an attitude that was patronizing, but not contemptuous. Another was its relatively greater tendency to scapegoat ideological rather than racial groupings, such as freemasons, Socialists and Communists. A third was its Catholic underpinnings, which may have ensured that Francoist colonial aspirations, in contrast to the supremacist ruthlessness of National-Socialist expansionism, at least superficially incorporated a more benignly proselytizing component. Further consultation of contemporary propaganda texts, and of relevant censorship reports, would be required to define precisely the overall profile and evolution of the Francoist attitude to race in children's literature.

In conclusion, however, it is important to reiterate the superficiality of the censors' preoccupation with racial prejudice in children's works. This is strongly suggested by the fact that no censor objected to the stereotypical characterization of Injun Joe as the murderous villain in *Tom Sawyer*. As in other areas of censorship, the censors clearly felt uncomfortable with overt, localized expressions of racism on the

part of characters in a work, but were largely unconcerned with prejudicial assumptions built into the overall narrative.

### **Conclusion**

The evidence thus far considered strongly suggests that attacks on figures of authority who were not religious were deemed less objectionable in translated children's books than either mockery of clerics or the portrayal of juvenile sexuality. Although the generally anti-authoritarian content of both the *William* series and *Tom Sawyer* undoubtedly contributed to their respective censorship difficulties, specific objections to, or outright suppression of, episodes in this category were relatively rarer than in the areas of religious and sexual censorship. Nevertheless, ridicule of teachers or other adult figures was considered unacceptable and worthy of suppression on various occasions, though only when such ridicule was considered to be particularly flagrant. Mockery of political figures or monarchs was occasionally not tolerated, though whether the specific allusion in question implied a more general rejection of authority seems to have had a bearing on this matter.

Two specific variables can thus be regarded as especially significant with regard to the censorship of subversive representations in children's books: firstly, the extent to which the representation in question implied a general rejection of authority or of an institution regarded as valuable in the Francoist scheme; secondly, the extent to which the subversion described was blatant or only veiled. Related to the latter factor was the question of whether the narrative implicitly condoned the subversive act by allowing it to go unpunished. In the most obvious examples of censorship in this category in the principal works studied, the fact that the perpetrators of the mockery derived gain, whether financial or in terms of emotional satisfaction, undoubtedly made the episodes in question especially unacceptable.

Ironically, the foreign setting of translated works appears to have militated in their favour in the later Francoist period. On numerous occasions in the *William* books particularly, anti-authoritarian attitudes (and sometimes acts) were excused which would surely not have been tolerated in a Spanish setting. It seems that the later censors viewed the vast majority of William's exploits as simply too far-fetched and outrageous to be susceptible to imitation. The foreign setting is likely to have fed into

this notion by suggesting a general distance between the 'exotic' world of the series and the very different world inhabited by the Spanish child reader. It may also be the case that the censors felt that satire aimed at the society portrayed in the works generally (as opposed to specific flagrant attacks on figures of authority) tended to criticize English society only, rather than established values generally.

The *William* books demonstrate that the portrayal of patriotic foreign characters in children's books was acceptable in the later Francoist period. The fact that works in which war and patriotism are mentioned were not submitted for censorship until long after the Second World War suggests, however, that this may not have been the case during the Second World War and in its immediate aftermath. Portrayals of unsuccessful or misguided patriotic enterprises were also permitted in the *William* books. Only comparison with analogous Spanish works might determine whether the foreign setting mitigated the unpatriotic implications of such portrayals in the eyes of the censors (see p.299, below).

Objections to portrayals of racial prejudice in the later period are a somewhat surprising feature of the regime's response to children's literature. It is likely that orthodox attitudes to such portrayals shifted as Fascist notions of racial supremacy waned at the expense of a somewhat more humane Christian attitude to race. Future studies of representations of race in children's literature should bear this diachronic scheme in mind, since the evolution of the regime's response may be particularly revealing in this area.

## NOTES:

1. *Deterring Democracy* (London: Vintage, 1992), p.264.
2. The categories of censorship examined in this chapter coincide broadly with those defined in Item 2(g) of the *Reglamento* (though censorship relating to other Items is also discussed where relevant). The final category of prohibition described in Item 2(g), '[ridiculización] de la obediencia a las leyes' is treated separately in Chapter 7.
3. 'She was a stout, healthy lady, who spent all her time recovering from a slight illness she had had two years ago. Her life held two occupations, and only two. These were eating and sleeping' (*Just William* (MacMillan: London and Basingstoke, 1983), p.83).
4. The *William* books contain numerous examples of ill-feeling between family members, a point specifically made by Quintana in his attack on the series (see p.123, above). Whilst these do not necessarily always constitute assaults on authority, they nevertheless transgress Item 2(g), which establishes the family as sacrosanct. Antipathy between siblings also extends to the friends or romantic partners of the characters concerned (see example (ii), below). The following examples from *Guillermo el bueno* (no.9) serve to illustrate the frequency of transgression in this area in the series generally:-
  - i. Probablemente cuando el enemigo extranjero comenzara a disparar contra ellos matándoles [a los familiares adultos de Guillermo], continuarían mirándole a [Guillermo], y metiéndose con su cabello, su cara o cualquier otra cosa. Nada ... nada ... podría detenerles jamás. Con amargura se preguntó si semejantes personas merecían la vida. (p.70)
  - ii. La causa de todos los problemas era el fatal atractivo de Ethel, la hermana de Guillermo. No es que Guillermo ni ninguno de sus amigos admitieran su atractivo fatal. Para ellos Ethel era una persona 'mayor', desagradable y vulgar, de modales altaneros e imposibles sistemas de limpieza, quien casualmente poseía además una combinación de melena roja, y ojos azules, que causaban un efecto extraño e imprevisto en los miembros adultos del sexo contrario. Los Proscritos sentían un odio profundo e intenso por todos los admiradores de Ethel. (p.151)
  - iii. Era un penacho tan magnífico [regalado por Roberto] que Guillermo sintióse invadido de una extraordinaria sensación de gratitud que le ató las manos y envenenó la paz de su mente, haciéndole mostrarse cortés y sumiso con Roberto, y Guillermo odiaba mostrarse cortés y sumiso con nadie. Le gustaba sentirse libre para poder continuar su enemistad perpetua con Roberto, cosa que daba a la vida la emoción necesaria. (p.205)

As Savater points out, however, William's 'hatred' of his family is extremely superficial: 'El desprecio por los padres, sin embargo, es una vocación miserable, que la magnanimidad apasionada de Guillermo no consiente. Guillermo *adora* a su familia con todo el intenso vigor de que su espíritu brioso es capaz; la adora sin dejar de luchar contra sus limitaciones ni cejar en su activa protesta contra lo impuesto' (emphasis as in original; Savater, 1976, p.70).
5. Gabinete de Lectura Santa Teresa de Jesús, *Catálogo crítico de libros para niños: 1957-1960* (Madrid: Servicio Nacional de Lectura, 1961).

6. Numerous examples of brutal schoolteachers are to be found in Spanish novels. One amongst many is Pedro Polo in Galdos's *Tormento*, whose activities are recounted as follows:  

Alarmados los padres por los malos tratos de que eran objetos aquellos pedazos de su corazón, los retiraban de la clase, poniéndolos en otra de procedimientos más benignos. Y en la misma calle se estableció un maestro que propalaba voces absurdas sobre los horrores que hacía Polo con sus alumnos, descoyuntándoles los brazos, hendiéndoles el cráneo, despegándoles las orejas y sacándoles tiras de pellejo. Más tarde los transeúntes vieron que por una de las ventanas bajas salía volando una criatura, como proyectil disparado por una catapulta. Otras cosas se referían igualmente espantables; pero no todo lo que se dijo merece crédito. Los pasantes contaban que algunos días estaba el maestro como loco furioso, dando gritos y echando de su boca juramentos y vocablos impropios de un señor sacerdote. (Benito Pérez Galdós, *Tormento* (Madrid: Alianza, 1994), pp.92-93)
7. Consultation of the copy of Juventud's 1969 edition in the Biblioteca Nacional reveals that María Teresa Quintana's translation of this passage does tend to suggest more of an official link between the detective and some institutional power, by the inclusion of the word 'policiaca', than Twain's original: 'Una de las maravillas policiacas omnipresentes, un detective, vino de San Luis para ocuparse del caso [...]' (pp.156-57).
8. The censorship files on both the Rodas and Paulinas editions contain an initial, pre-censorship copy and a censored copy of their respective versions. In the initial Rodas version, the relevant sentence reads: 'La multitud iba llegando a la iglesia: el administrador de Correos, un viejecito venido a menos y que había conocido tiempos mejores; el alcalde y su mujer - *pues tenían allí alcalde, entre otras cosas innecesarias* - ; el juez de paz' (p.34). The phrase I have italicized has been crossed out in red ink in the initial copy. In the censored version, it has been omitted. In the Paulinas edition, the phrase marked for suppression, also omitted in Paulinas's censored version, reads 'porque entre otras cosas superfluas tenían alcalde' (p.40).
9. In making this assertion, I am assuming that the original prohibition of *Guillermo el organizador* in 1943 was not motivated by the mockery of civil authority in the episodes in which the bishop became a government minister, and the vicar became the mayor. Although these substitutions are clearly marked in the only copy in the censorship file for this work, they seem to have been added after the censor made his report, for he refers to 'el obispo, sacerdotes', who are not present in the modified version. I am thus assuming that when the censor called the work 'irreverente' and 'impertinente', he was referring to the original, unmodified version. How these modifications came to be effected subsequently remains a mystery.
10. Despite the general tolerance towards allusions to dictators, the desire to avoid provoking the censors seems to underlie Molino's decision to translate the title *William the Dictator* as *Guillermo el luchador*. Generally, Molino's Spanish titles were as literal as possible, as can be appreciated in Appendix A.
11. Interestingly, the insinuation that William possessed a 'natural repugnancia a matar a sus semejantes' turns out to be an embellishment of the translator's. The original reads simply: 'If Mr. Martin were a Communist, William had decided to fight Ginger

for the post of head of the Communist party' (*William the Bad* (London, Newnes, 1930), p.63).

12. Henry's words in the original are as follows: 'Socialism means takin' other people's money off 'em. Well, think how much richer we'd be if we'd got other people's money as well as our own' (*William the Bad*, p.67).
13. A considerable number of years also elapsed between the first appearance of the allusions to dictators in the original works, and their appearance in the Spanish translations of the *William* books. Most of these allusions appeared in *William and A.R.P.* (1939) and, particularly, *William and the Evacuees* (1940). These were both reprinted in 1956 as, respectively, *William's Bad Resolution* and *William the Film Star*. It was these reprinted and retitled versions which Molino used to make their translations. Potentially, therefore, Molino could have submitted texts containing allusions to Hitler and Mussolini during the Franco regime's period of collusion with the Axis powers. As with the election episode, the censors would no doubt have taken rather more notice had Molino done so.
14. The 'Spaniard' is certainly retained in the versions of María Teresa Quintana, published by Juventud (nos.18, 31), and of Manfredo Kempff, published by Rodas (no.58).
15. *Guillermo artista de cine* (no.24), p.192. The following works contain various scenes in which William attempts to assist the war effort *William's Bad Resolution* (1956; originally published as *William and A.R.P.* in 1939), *William the Film Star* (1956; originally published as *William and the Evacuees* in 1940), *William Does His Bit* (1941), *William Carries On* (1942) and *William and the Brains Trust* (1945). The Spanish translations of these works were published without censorship difficulties.
16. Further investigation would be required in order to determine whether any publisher of *Tom Sawyer* suppressed this allusion before submitting their edition for censorship. I base my claim that the allusion was 'apparently never suppressed' on the fact that it is not mentioned in any censorship report, nor marked for suppression in any text submitted for censorship. Given the parallel evidence of the *William* books, it seems unlikely that any publisher would have considered the prior suppression of this reference necessary, even in later children's editions of the work, though it may have been omitted from such editions as part of a process of overall abridgement or adaptation.
17. This point is complicated by the ambivalent Francoist attitude to the Bourbons, two of whom (Louis XIV and Louis XV) are mentioned in Huck's catalogue of scandalous monarchs. Though the Bourbons are derided as French interlopers in early Francoist propaganda texts (see Serrano de Haro, 1966, pp.34-37), the fact that Juan Carlos was himself a Bourbon may have made derogatory allusions to the dynasty a somewhat sensitive point in the later Franco period.
18. Mark Twain, *Huck Finn, el negro, y Tom Sawyer*, trans. by Simón Santainés (Barcelona: Mateu, 1957). I have been unable to locate the official censorship file for this edition.
19. Mark Twain, *El detective distraído* (Barcelona: Bruguera, 1964).



## CHAPTER SEVEN: VIOLENCE, TERROR and CRIME

He who sentimentally sings of blessed childhood is thinking of the return to nature and innocence and the origin of things, and has quite forgotten that these blessed children are beset with conflict and complexities and capable of all suffering. (Hermann Hesse)<sup>1</sup>

### Introduction

In the 1956 *Reglamento*, representations of criminality in children's books are dealt with principally in Item 2(e):

[Se evitarán] las novelas o relatos policíacos y de aventuras en los que se exalte el odio, la agresividad y la venganza; aquellos en que aparezca atrayente la figura del criminal u ofrezca a la imitación de los pequeños lectores las técnicas del robo, el fraude, la mentira, la astucia, la hipocresía y el bandidaje.

These specific prohibitions are reinforced by the rather more general proscriptions, in Item 2(g) of 'toda desviación del humorismo hacia la ridiculización [...] de la obediencia a las Leyes', and in Item 3(b) of '[los relatos] que presenten a una luz favorable las reacciones antisociales [...] porque muestren el éxito logrado poniendo en juego los mecanismos de agresión al margen de las leyes'.

Interestingly, the authors of the 1967 *Estatuto* promoted the section relating to criminal behaviour to first position in the hierarchy of prohibitions regarding the content of children's works:

9(a): [Habrá de evitarse cuanto suponga o pueda suponer] exaltación o apología de hechos o conductas inmorales o que puedan ser constitutivos de delito, o presentación de los mismos en forma tal que pueda causar perturbación en la formación del lector y sin la debida consecuencia de reprobación, o que muestre o sugiera técnicas para su comisión.

A parallel movement took place in the case of the proscriptions concerning representations of violence and terror. In the *Reglamento*, these are addressed briefly in Item 3(a), which established the unacceptability of 'las escenas terroríficas o de cualquier índole que puedan afectar profundamente el equilibrio psicológico del niño'. In the *Estatuto* the equivalent section is promoted to second in the hierarchy of concerns (9(b)), although as with the section referring to criminality, it is fused with other items of the *Reglamento* (2(a) to (2(d)), and 2(f)):

[Habrá de evitarse] presentación escrita o gráfica de escenas o argumentos [...] en que se resalte el terror, la violencia, el sadismo, el erotismo, el suicidio, la eutanasia, el alcoholismo, la toxicomanía o demás taras sociales, o tratamiento de los temas en forma morbosa o sensacionalista o que de alguna manera

pueda originar perturbación o desviación psicológica o educacional de los lectores.

It is striking to compare the very detailed definition of orthodoxy in the areas of religion, morality and sexuality enshrined in Items 1(a) to 2(d) of the *Reglamento*, on the one hand, with the vague allusions to 'conductas inmorales' and 'el erotismo' of Sections 9(a) and (b) of the *Estatuto*, on the other. The defence of organized religion, as remarked in Chapter 4, has also been diluted to include non-Catholic confessions, and is relegated from first to third position in the order of exposition of the later legislation (Section 9(c) of the *Estatuto*). What is relevant to this chapter is that whilst religion and sexuality are devalued in the 1967 *Estatuto* as compared to the 1956 *Reglamento*, it is clear that violence and criminality ascended the hierarchy of concerns in the period between the two pieces of legislation.

It is possible to view this shift in emphasis from the *Reglamento* to the *Estatuto* as a liberalizing evolution from the aggressive imposition of religious and sexual orthodoxy, towards the merely paternalistic protection of the child from psychological corruption through exposure to criminality and violence. The regime no doubt hoped it would be viewed as such. However, the evidence of *Tom Sawyer* suggests that whilst the censor's response to unorthodox portrayals of religion modified somewhat in later years, it did not necessarily become less rigorous (see p.191, above). Equally, the sexual suppression imposed on *Travesuras de Guillermo* (p.208, above), and the repeated objections in the later period to Tom's relationship with Becky in *Tom Sawyer*, suggest that tolerance towards portrayals of juvenile sexuality in children's books did not increase in any detectable sense, but continued to be determined by considerations of precedent and target readership.

It may thus appear that the relegation of religion and sexuality as censorship preoccupations, and the corresponding promotion of criminality and violence, was merely a cosmetic ploy. However, there seems to be some evidence in censorship practice that whilst religion and sexuality were perennial concerns, the response to which did not dramatically alter throughout the regime, representations of criminality and violence did in fact acquire greater significance for the censors of children's books in the later period. This development does not constitute anything so radical as a shift in ideology on the part of the regime. Rather, it was an inevitable consequence of the

evolution of the children's literature market, and particularly the rise of the comic which began in the mid-1940s.

In this regard, it is revealing to compare the prohibited categories listed in Section 9(b) of the *Estatuto* (above), with Luis Gasca's remarks on the development of the comic in the post-Second World War period: 'El terror, con su secuela el sadismo, junto con el erotismo y la deificación del héroe invencible, son ingredientes que se han hecho imprescindibles en la confección del "comic" popular' (Gasca, 1966, p.86). The coincidence between the ingredients of the comic identified by Gasca and the categories of prohibition named in the *Estatuto* strongly suggests that the legislation was designed to regulate this area of literary production particularly.<sup>2</sup>

It is clear from the *Reglamento* that even by 1956, the regime was concerned about the growth of certain genres, and particularly their encroachment on the area of children's literature. This is evident in Item 2(e), which particularly specifies 'las novelas o relatos policíacos y de aventuras' as genres in which criminal, deceitful or aggressive behaviour was likely to be prevalent. The fact that a large number of detective and adventure stories, and particularly comics were of foreign origin meant that prudent self-censorship according to National- Catholic mores was not exercised in the majority of such works. The steady increase in the mass-production of such works as the Franco era wore on, as a consequence of economic as well as cultural forces, meant the appearance on the Spanish book market of an ascending proportion of works in which violence and criminality were considered integral ingredients.<sup>3</sup>

Judging from the relative scarcity with which they are mentioned in existing works on Francoist censorship, it seems that violence, terror and criminality were generally tolerated to a much greater degree than sexual or political transgressions in adult literature. Rosa Chacel explicitly alludes to the relative lack of censorship in this area in her assessment of Francoist censorship generally, and frankly identifies its cause:

La censura, en el orden político, es la más difícil de evitar porque los poderes vigentes se acorazan en ella. [...] La censura, en el terreno del sexo, suele ser de una estupidez infinita. [...] En el terreno del crimen es amplia, es benigna, es inexistente. La literatura policial o de aventuras o de intriga, nada tiene que temer de la censura; los *poderes vigentes económicos* de su inacabable difusión industrial la protegen de ella. (Emphasis as in original; Beneyto, pp.237-38)

The increasing emphasis on criminality and violence as a censorship concern in the legislation governing children's literature strongly suggests that the tolerance in this area described by Chacel is unlikely to have applied to books specifically aimed at children. This chapter assesses the evidence of censorship practice in this regard, in addition to examining the effect of prestige and context on the orthodox response to representations of criminal or violent behaviour.

#### (i) Violence and Terror

The censorship history of *Tom Sawyer* tends to confirm the impression that criminality and violence were a particular concern of the censors in the field of children's literature. This can be inferred from the fact that the only censor in the earlier period who identified an edition of the work as being intended for children (no.3), specifically mentioned the unsuitability of criminal elements in it: 'Se ensalza en cierto modo, la piratería. [...] El ideal de los protagonistas es llegar a ser ladrones, objeto que consiguen, aunque un poco en juego, al final de la novela'.

Amongst the passages he marked for suppression, the censor also identified several episodes or allusions in which violent, as well as criminal, acts are described. By far the longest passage he regarded as requiring suppression, for example, recounts the murder of Doctor Robinson, which occurs in Chapter 9 of *Tom Sawyer*. Other editions of the work submitted in this era which were not regarded as being specifically for children include this episode, and contain all of the other passages marked for suppression by the Nausica censor (nos.1, 6, 9, 13). Perhaps somewhat surprisingly, however, the murder episode was also included, though in attenuated form, in Marco's sixteen-page comicbook version of 1942, which was manifestly for children.

This lack of censorship should be contrasted with the persistent objection to the murder scene in numerous editions in the later period, when *Tom Sawyer's* identity as a children's book became a contentious issue. Objection to this scene in particular was first expressed explicitly in the report on the 1966 Juventud edition (no.31), and thereafter became commonplace in reports on *Tom Sawyer*. In the case of the Plan edition of 1969 (no.39), the censor imposed various graphic, as well as textual, suppressions, including all appearances of the knife in the murder scene. This is in

stark contrast to the Marco edition of 1942 (no.2), which includes an image of the dripping knife in an unsuppressed illustration of the scene.

Even after the work had grudgingly been afforded a degree of positive precedent, the censors continued to single out the murder scene as an unequivocally inappropriate feature of the work if it was to be marketed for children, until in 1973 the scene in question became the only objection raised by the censors of the Boga and Everest editions (nos.48 and 51), which were nevertheless published. Furthermore, in the proofs of various editions submitted after the period in office of Sánchez Bella, for which reports were either not made or are missing from the file, the murder episode has been marked for suppression. This applies, for example, to the Rodas and Paulinas editions of 1974 (nos.58, 59). It should be clarified, however, that in the case of the former edition the passage marked has not been suppressed or modified in the censored copy also present in the file. In the case of the latter edition, only one key phrase describing the act itself has been modified in the censored copy. In the uncensored copy, the phrase reads '*en el mismo instante, el mestizo aprovechó la ocasión y hundió el cuchillo hasta la empuñadura en el pecho del joven*'. In the censored version, the phrase I have italicized reads '*e hirió gravemente, con un rápido movimiento, al joven*' (p.72).

It is of course possible to argue that the suppression of this scene, which after all takes place in a cemetery, belongs to the category of religious censorship. Various censors specifically alluded to the location of the episode, suggesting that they did indeed regard the scene as especially unacceptable because of the religious setting (nos.39, 40, 44, 46, 49, 51). In the Plan edition of 1969 (no.39), for example, all graphic images of headstones have been marked for suppression, as well as all textual allusions to the cemetery. In the censored copy, the text describes the murder as taking place in a '*dehesa*', and the headstones have been removed from the illustrations.

The transgression of the sixth commandment also means that the scene is clearly objectionable on purely religious grounds. The fact that the murder was suppressed completely in various editions certainly suggests that some censors did indeed object to the mere presence of a murder in a work intended for children. In the case of both Plan and Fenix's 1969 editions (nos.39 and 41), for example, the murder related in the original versions submitted for censorship becomes mere assault and robbery in the

censored versions. Subsequent allusions to the act are altered accordingly, so that where Joe accuses Muff at the latter's trial with the words '¡Tú le mataste, Muff!' in Plan's original, for example, the censored version has '¡Tú le golpeaste, Muff!'. The logic of the narrative clearly suffers in this instance, since the attentive reader is bound to ask why Doctor Robinson himself is not testifying at the trial, if he is the victim of the assault.

An example from the *William* books also tends to reveal that mere allusions to murder, rather than actual descriptions of it, were thought likely, at least in some cases, to provoke the objection of the censors. The following phrase appears in the proofs of *Guillermo el malo* (no.10), in an episode in which William is recruiting 'missionaries' for a proselytizing expedition to Asia:

-Debéis tener cuidado con esos asiáticos. Como son tan raros, les gusta, como a todos los paganos, matar a la gente. [...] Pero obedecen estrictamente a una ley. Jamás asesinan a nadie que corra hacia ellos con la cara pintada de negro. (p.144)

The words 'matar' and 'asesinar' have been crossed out in the proofs, and both replaced with the word 'maltratar'. This modification was presumably the work of the translator or editor, since the censorship report contains no allusions to any official objections. The fact that the publishers felt that even passing and hypothetical references to murderous pagans were likely to be considered objectionable suggests that the mere fact of murder was thought inappropriate in a children's work on religious or moral grounds.

Nevertheless, I have chosen to discuss the murder episode in this chapter, because there is some evidence that it was the degree of macabre detail in Twain's description of the murder, rather than the mere presence of the act itself, which prompted a number of the censors to object to the episode. It is useful at this point to remind ourselves of Twain's original passage, which certainly relates the event in graphic prose:

All at once the doctor flung himself free, seized the heavy headboard of William's grave and felled Potter to the earth with it; and in the same instant the half-breed saw his chance and drove the knife to the hilt in the young man's breast. He reeled and fell partly upon Potter, flooding him with his blood, and in the same moment the clouds blotted out the dreadful spectacle, and the two frightened boys went speeding away in the dark. (p.55)

The wording of several censorship reports constitutes the first piece of evidence that the vividness of Twain's description of the murder, rather than the mere fact that the sinful act was included at all, contributed to orthodox unease regarding this episode. In the case of the Bruguera edition of 1972 (no.46), the censor reported that '[las páginas citadas] refieren *sin paliativos* la profanación de una tumba y el asesinato en un cementerio (ambos sucesos presenciados por menores)' (my emphasis). The impression that the gory detail of the description, rather than merely the act described, at least partly motivated orthodox objection to the scene is strengthened by the wording of the report on the 1973 Boga edition (no.50): 'Por considerar objetables para menores de doce años la profanación de tumbas y cadáveres y el asesinato, *con los agravantes que concurren en la descripción hecha por el autor*, se informa como conveniente proceder a la supresión de los párrafos señalados: [...]' (my emphasis).

It is also notable that this scene is included, but only in attenuated form, in various editions, suggesting that some publishers felt that inclusion of the act itself might be tolerated by the censors, as indeed it often was, as long as it was not described in excessive detail. As remarked above, Marco's sixteen-page 1942 edition (no.3), for example, contains an illustration of the scene, but the textual description is limited to the words 'era el indio Joe, que acababa de matar a un hombre'. The Boga edition of 1973 attenuates the scene, in accordance with the censor's objection to its macabre detail described above, by eliminating direct allusions to the murder weapon and to the act of killing itself. The censored version of the act, and particularly the accompanying dialogue, thus has an oddly euphemistic ring, as the following comparison demonstrates:

**Uncensored version:**

El indio, que se había levantado, aprovechó para clavar el cuchillo en la espalda de Robinson, que ya no volvería a levantarse. [...]

-Mira lo que has hecho, Muff. Mientras peleabas con el doctorcito, has sacado el cuchillo y parece que lo has matado. (pp.7-8)

**Censored version:**

El indio, que se había levantado, aprovechó para atacar por la espalda a Robinson, que ya no volvería a levantarse. [...]

-Mira lo que has hecho, Muff. Mientras peleabas con el doctorcito le has agredido con tu arma. (p.20)

These examples of editions which attenuate but do not eliminate the murder episode suggest that some censors objected to the scene on the grounds that Twain's

evocation of it was simply too graphic, rather than because it was present at all.<sup>4</sup> Objection on such a subjective basis was thoughtfully provided for in the legislation, which proscribed 'escenas terroríficas' (Item 3(a)) or 'el terror' (Section 9(b)). The completely unspecific character of these categories of proscription allowed the censors to suppress more or less anything they thought might upset the impressionable child reader. The censors may also have felt that the explicitness of the original description constituted 'tratamiento [de los temas] en forma morbosa o sensacionalista' (Section 9(b)).

This response to the degree of explicitness with which the violent act is described immediately suggests a parallel between the censorship of violence and the censorship of subversion in children's literature. In both cases, it was not the mere presence of an unorthodox feature in a given allusion, but rather the flagrancy or overtness with which it was manifested, which determined whether the particular allusion was deemed to be objectionable or not. As was noted in Chapter 5, this rule also seems to apply to the censorship of sexual evocations in adult literature (p.204, above), though less so in the case of children's literature, where suppression of sexual allusions appears to have been close to systematic (as is also the case with unorthodox religious allusions).

As in the case of subversive or political references, considerations of context also appear to have influenced the censors' response to violent allusions. There is unequivocal evidence that the regime itself frequently used violent images in propagandistic and religious textbooks as a means of inculcating conformity through terror. Macabre examples of such images are provided by Sopeña (pp.66-76), who cites from Ramón Sarabia's *A los niños pláticas y ejemplos*, a religious textbook used during the Franco era.<sup>5</sup> The degree of explicitness in the following passages from this work surely equals or exceeds that of the murder scene in *Tom Sawyer*:

Allí en aquel barranco, entre los coches destrozados yacían sepultados y convertidos en una masa informe de barro, carne y sangre los cadáveres de las dos muchachas. (Sarabia, p.64)

Allí, sobre la vía, al lado de los raíles estaba el cadáver de un niño de unos cuatro años. [...] Estaba del todo desnudito. Hasta los calcetines le había arrancado el aire comprimido. [...] No tenía cabeza. [...] La buscamos y la hallamos al fin. Iba en la rueda de la máquina. (Sarabia, p.66)



Y el fuego avanzaba. Empezaron a arder vivos algunos niños. Daban unos aullidos espantosos. [...] Llamaban los pobrecitos a su madre, a su padre. [...] ¡Y no los podían socorrer! [...] Y las llamas se cebaban implacables en sus carnes blandas. Y el fuego avanzaba. [...] Llegó a la puerta donde estaban amontonados multitud de chiquillos y chiquillas, y aquella masa de carne humana empezó a arder. (Sarabia, p.360)

The fact that the victims of violent retribution in these examples are children surely makes their impact on the child reader more powerful still. This is of course intentional, since these passages form part of cautionary tales in which wayward children are punished. In the case of the examples cited by Sopeña, the children in question had erred by indulging in 'vices' such as frequenting cinemas, theatres and dances (Sopeña, p.66). The authors of such tales, and the teachers who used them as pedagogic tools, no doubt reasoned that the more macabre the description of the punishment, the more terrified the child reader would become. The greater the terror, the more thorough the inculcation of conformity.

Another example of a cautionary tale containing graphic scenes of violence and torture of children is the anonymous illustrated booklet *Aventuras de Marmolillo*. There is no evidence that this work was specifically used in Francoist schools, but it was certainly published and disseminated as a children's work during the period.<sup>6</sup> Its content demonstrates that the violent images permitted by the regime could reach levels of grisliness which make the murder scene in *Tom Sawyer* seem decidedly subdued by comparison.

'Marmolillo' is a young girl who collects butterflies. One night, she is kidnapped by giants. One of the giants takes her to his grotto, where he orders her to remove her clothes, but she refuses. Though she pleads to be returned to her parents, her captor merely laughs, and forcibly strips her. He then begins to file her shoulder-blades:

Una vez la tuvo desnudita, sujetóla entre sus piernas de acero, y cogiendo una lima muy gruesa que tenía, comenzó a limarle con furia los huesos de la espalda que llamamos *omoplatos*.

Calculad los gritos que daría Marmolillo al sentirse limar primero la piel y después la carne viva, y notar que la sangre que salía de ambas heridas, resbalaba por su cintura.

Marmolillo is then tied up and left to examine her conscience. The giant later returns and continues his work:

Venía satisfecho trayendo en cada mano una bellísima ala de mariposa: aplicó primero una a la herida menos tierna, apretándola con los dedos fuertemente, hasta quedar allí pegada; luego, hizo lo propio con la segunda, que colocó sobre la herida más fresca, mientras murmuraba: 'Para terminar, sólo falta clavarla en el almohadón'. [...] A su vuelta, desató a Marmolillo, colocóla con mucho tiento boca abajo sobre un extraño cojín, y tomando una especie de espada que allí cerca tenía, clavó en él a la niña, de un solo golpe, atravesándola de parte en parte, y apretando, hasta que la tocó con el pomo la cintura. La infeliz sintió un dolor espantoso, y lanzó un grito capaz de enternecer a las piedras.

Each stage of the process described above is represented in pictures. Marmolillo is then hung from the wall of a storeroom, on her cushion, in which other children are displayed in a similar fashion. Finally, Marmolillo awakens to discover that it has all been a terrible dream: 'un sueño, empero, que había barrido de su corazón la crueldad para siempre'. In the final illustration, in which Marmolillo is depicted waking joyfully from the nightmare, a crucifix above her head is seen to radiate light.

It is immediately obvious that the degree of violence manifested in this scene far exceeds that of the murder scene in *Tom Sawyer*. Indeed, one might contrast directly the suppression or modification of the act of stabbing itself in various editions of *Tom Sawyer* with the unsuppressed account, which is surely at least equally detailed, of Marmolillo's impalement at the hands of the giant. The description of the filing of the shoulder-blades and subsequent acts is extraordinarily minute, and the suffering of the child victim is deliberately accentuated throughout ('calculad los gritos que daría Marmolillo'; 'la infeliz sintió un dolor espantoso').

The graphic sadism depicted in this work is difficult to reconcile with the prohibition of 'las escenas terroríficas [...] que puedan afectar profundamente el equilibrio psicológico del niño' (Item 3(a)) or 'presentación escrita o gráfica de escenas o argumentos [...] en los que se resalte el terror' (Section 9(b)). It is obvious that terror is used quite deliberately in the service of the work's didactic intention. The regime thus evidently had no particular qualms about terrifying children, as long as they were terrified into conforming to the orthodox model. Scenes of *criminal* terror and violence in which any implicit note of authorial condemnation was not sufficiently obvious, or which the censors viewed as gratuitous, or which actively tended to promote actual

violence as a possible solution to conflict, were no doubt what the censors had in mind when they drew up the legislation.

One might consider various other factors which could help to explain why *Marmolillo* was deemed to contain an acceptable form of violence, whereas *Tom Sawyer* was not. Firstly, the fact that the violence in *Marmolillo* takes place on an oneiric plane, whereas that of *Tom Sawyer* forms part of the novel's 'reality', may have affected the censor's respective attitude to the works. The fact that the level of verisimilitude of *Marmolillo* generally, even in those sections of the narrative not concerned with the dream, is inevitably less than that of *Tom Sawyer*, because the former is merely an allegorical fable whereas the latter is a novel, may also have been decisive. *Tom Sawyer's* much greater attention to the evocation of milieu and character may have led the censors to believe that children would experience the violence in it as more real than in the case of a work such as *Marmolillo*.

It seems, however, that the fantastical setting of a work was not necessarily considered to mitigate any violence or other unorthodox features it contained. This is illustrated by the censorship report on a French edition of *Snow White and the Seven Dwarfs*, a self-evidently fantastical tale, submitted in 1968:

Extensa versión del conocido cuento, en el que se contienen íntegramente los pasajes de odio, envidia, crueldad y sentimientos homicidas tan inconvenientes en libros para lectores infantiles, categoría a la que claramente se dirige. Se estima desaconsejable su autorización (Comisión Infantil).

The publishers were consequently denied permission to import the work on this occasion.<sup>7</sup>

Further evidence that the degree of realism or verisimilitude did not necessarily affect the censor's response to violence or terror is provided by the report on Castalia's application to publish Bram Stoker's *Dracula* in 1942 (2-335/6824). The work received the following response from the provincial censor: 'Propuesta para su prohibición, por tratarse de una obra truculenta y desagradable'. Conde ratified his colleague's decision with the following report: 'Por el argumento excesivamente terrorífico y absurdo de dicha novela, opinamos debe suspenderse su publicación'. In Conde's report, in a fashion we can now regard as typical, two features which might be expected to have cancelled each other out did not in fact do so in the mind of the censor. If the plot fails to confer verisimilitude on a work, which is what Conde clearly implies when he

dismisses it as 'absurdo', it surely cannot logically be regarded as 'terrorífico' at the same time, since in order to be terrified the reader first has to be imaginatively convinced.<sup>8</sup>

It seems likely that considerations of literary taste and prestige had a bearing on this matter. This is strongly suggested by censor Pineiro's report on the Editorial Apolo's application in 1942 to publish Robert Louis Stevenson's *The Strange Case of Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* in which the fantastic scenario of the work is explicitly cited as a mitigating factor:

Es una de las más originales y mejor escritas novelas de aventuras de la literatura mundial. Puede autorizarse, pues el tema es fantástico hasta tal punto que no corre peligro nadie, y la exposición es maravillosa.<sup>9</sup>

It thus seems that individual censors may have excused evocations of horrific or violent scenarios on the grounds that they were tastefully incorporated, and formed part of a work whose basic premise was not entirely objectionable (the strong sense of Christian morality underlying *Dr Jekyll and Mr Hyde* no doubt helped its cause considerably).

Further evidence that a high degree of verisimilitude alone was not necessarily considered an exacerbating feature of violent descriptions is the fact that the regime itself used explicit violent images in historical accounts in pedagogic texts. Agustín Serrano de Haro's *Yo soy español*, for example, relates the Roman occupation of the Peninsula. One accompanying illustration shows wild animals devouring praying figures in an amphitheatre (p.17). A little later, a popular revolt against the Romans led by a shepherd named Viriato is described. An accompanying illustration depicts a Roman slitting the throat of the captured rebel (p.20).<sup>10</sup> The decapitation by a Roman governor of two defiant Christian martyrs, the brothers Justo and Pastor, is described soon afterwards (pp.27-29). The relevant illustration shows one of the brothers on the ground bleeding from the throat, the other on the point of being executed (p.28).

It is clear from these examples that the regime consciously used horrific evocations of real events in order to communicate its view of history. The openly emotive character of orthodox didactic material, and the specific legitimacy of evocations of suffering, is explicitly acknowledged in Serrano de Haro's instructions to teachers regarding the story of the Moorish invasion: 'Que provoque repugnancia en el corazón de los chiquitines la vileza de los traidores, la vileza de todo traidor.

Destacar el dolor de la persecución al que está constantemente expuesto un pueblo que no vela a sus enemigos de afuera y adentro' (p.33). The relatively greater verisimilitude of the violent descriptions in *Tom Sawyer*, as compared to those contained in *Marmolillo*, thus cannot explain, on its own, the censors' divergent responses to the two works.

One might also argue, however, that since the moral itself of *Marmolillo* is that cruelty recoils on its perpetrator on some level or other, some exposition of cruel acts was an inevitable part of the tale. However, this does not explain the equally graphic violence in Ramón Sarabia's *A los niños Pláticas y Ejemplos*, discussed above, in which terror is used to discourage a whole range of unorthodox characteristics such as vanity, dissoluteness and ingratitude.<sup>11</sup> Furthermore, it is possible to view the plot of *Tom Sawyer* as equally exemplary in this regard, since Injun Joe eventually suffers a painful death as a consequence of his actions. Why the ultimate condemnation of Injun Joe was regarded as insufficient mitigation for the description of the murder he perpetrates is unclear, but it seems likely that the censors' overall disapproval of the work, in the later period, caused them to respond with particular indignation to any superficially unorthodox features, whether these were subverted by the overall narrative scheme or not.

With regard to these considerations of narrative viewpoint, and in the light of the regime's extensive use of judicial execution by various means, it is interesting to note that in the proofs of the 1969 Plan edition of *Tom Sawyer* (no.39), Tom's prediction that 'ahorcarán al viejo Muff' has been crossed out and changed in the censored version to 'condenarán al viejo Muff' (p.8, printed proofs of both versions). Given the regime's open use of the *garrote vil* method of execution as late as 1974 (*Franco*, p.766), this coy attitude towards allusions to the capital penalty in children's books seems especially hypocritical. The fact that Tom alludes to the awkward possibility of the irreversible penalty being applied to the wrong man may well have prompted this modification, at least partly. Even allusions to legally endorsed forms of violence could be considered dubious in the context of a children's book, it seems, if other considerations were deemed to obscure or undermine the legitimacy of violent judicial retribution.<sup>12</sup>

Ultimately, it should not surprise us that the orthodox response to violent or disturbing images in children's books appears to have been inconsistent in the extreme, since no other area of ideology better exemplifies the regime's propagandistic ambivalence and actual hypocrisy than the area of violence. This is reflected in the fact that the regime systematically eliminated large numbers of political prisoners for several years after the Nationalist victory (Preston, 1986, p.4), employed violent means of repression throughout its period in power, and yet accused its ideological enemies of barbarism and frequently preached a pious doctrine of peace (see p.17, above).

## (ii) Crime

In the later period, objections to general criminality in *Tom Sawyer* first appeared in the reports on the FHER and Ferma editions of 1960 and 1963 respectively (nos.23, 27), somewhat earlier than specific objections to the murder episode. It is interesting to reflect that the great majority of objections to criminality throughout *Tom Sawyer's* censorship history relate to the illegal activities of Injun Joe, whilst only two censors throughout the work's censorship history drew attention to the criminal aspirations of the child characters. This suggests that the censors generally accepted narratives in which children were shown using imaginary criminal scenarios in the context of play.

This is confirmed by the lack of any objection to the repeated allusions to William's 'Outlaws', or to other fantasy criminal roles adopted by William himself. That much of William's life is devoted to the adoption of such roles is evident from several of the titles in the series: *William the Outlaw*, *William the Pirate*, *William the Rebel*, *William the Gangster*, *William the Lawless*. Unlike *William the Dictator*, these titles were translated directly by Molino, indicating that the imaginary criminal pursuits of the protagonist were considered entirely uncontroversial.

Although children's criminal fantasies were rarely a source of specific objection, it is nonetheless revealing to examine the response (or lack of it) of both censors and translators to certain passages in which such fantasies are discussed. It will be recalled that the censor of the 1942 Nausica edition of *Tom Sawyer* asserted uneasily that 'se ensalza en cierto modo la piratería' and that 'el ideal de los protagonistas es llegar a ser ladrones, objeto que consiguen, aunque un poco en juego, al final de la novela'. The censor also marked the following highlighted phrase for

suppression by underlining in the proofs: 'Joe tenía el propósito de hacerse ermitaño [...] pero luego de escuchar a Tom admitió *que en una vida de crimen había ciertas ventajas notables, de modo que consintió en ser pirata*' (proofs, p.63; *Cinco Mejores Obras*, no.19, p.69). Orthodox discomfort with the sentiment expressed here is also discernible in Alfaro's modified rendering of the sentence: 'Se avino, sin embargo, a convertirse en pirata, porque Tom le convenció de que una vida consagrada a la aventura ofrecía no pocas ventajas' (no.9, pp.135-36).

It is interesting to compare this passage, which evidently offended orthodox sensibilities somewhat, with Tom's account of the piratical lifestyle a little later:

'Oh, they have just a bully time - take ships, and burn them, and get the money and bury it in awful places in their island where there's ghosts and things to watch it, and kill everybody in the ships - make 'em walk a plank'. (p.75)

Although the censor of the Nausica edition objected generally to the exaltation of piracy in *Tom Sawyer*, s/he did not mark this passage for suppression. On the face of it this seems inconsistent, given that s/he did recommend the excision of the earlier phrase concerning the advantages of a life of crime. The unsuppressed passage seems far more objectionable at first sight, describing wholesale murder, destruction of property and, for good measure, superstition concerning ghosts. Alfaro appears to show equal inconsistency by translating this passage without modifying the criminal elements in it (though she does omit the reference to ghosts), despite her distortion of the much vaguer earlier allusion.<sup>13</sup>

It is evident that Tom's account of piracy is derived from romanticized portrayals he has encountered in literature. One could therefore argue that the element of fantasy is more obvious in this description than in the more general allusion to the advantages of a life of crime. This explanation is not entirely convincing, however, since the conception of 'a life of crime' to which the boys are subscribing is explicitly clarified in the episode in question:

'It's just the life for me,' said Tom. 'You don't have to get up, mornings, and you don't have to go to school, and wash, and all that blame foolishness.

'You see a pirate don't have to do anything, Joe, when he's ashore, but a hermit he has to be praying considerable, and then he don't have any fun, any way, all by himself that way.' (p.74)

The principal attraction of a life of crime, then, as the boys see it, is that it provides them with an escape from the onerous obligations of being a child in St. Petersburg society. Later, however, the boys tire of their liberty, and begin to yearn for the comforts of civilization:

The stillness, the solemnity, that brooded in the woods, and the sense of loneliness, began to tell upon the spirits of the boys. They fell to thinking. A sort of undefined longing crept upon them. This took dim shape presently - it was budding home-sickness. (pp.78-79)

The narrative thus makes very clear that the opinion marked for suppression, 'que en una vida de crimen había ciertas ventajas notables', is only espoused by the boys in the realm of their imaginations: their brief taste of real freedom quickly convinces them that the benefits of society outweigh the impositions which had initially caused them to flee. Once again, it seems that the bluntness of the sentiment expressed, and its generality, caused the phrase to 'leap off the page' at the censor, provoking an indignation which could not be mollified by the presence of contextual ironies.

This reaction may well have been triggered particularly by the word 'crimen', three occurrences of which were suppressed in the 1975 Sima edition of *Tom Sawyer* (no.63), all on p.21 of the typed proofs.<sup>14</sup> This hypothesis tends to be supported by Alfaro's modification of this word to 'aventura' (see p.282, above). It is quite obvious from Twain's text that the boys *mean* adventure when they talk about crime, but Alfaro and the censor of the Nausica and Sima editions, and possibly other censors and translators as well, were clearly doubtful as to whether young readers were capable of understanding this. Further collation of editions would be required to determine whether this allusion was modified or suppressed in other versions of *Tom Sawyer*.

A striking example of the effect of precedent on the degree of censorship applied to a work is provided by *Guillermo el bueno* (no.9), which contains a passage rather similar to the one modified by Alfaro and marked for suppression by the censor of the Nausica edition:

[Pelirrojo y Guillermo] hablaron del robo como carrera, considerándola menos emocionante que la de pirata, aunque más atractiva que la de maquinista [...], carreras por las que siempre sintieron inclinación. (p.236)



Though the word 'crimen' does not figure here, the notion of children discussing specifically defined criminal activities as possible future careers seems to advocate criminality in a similar fashion, and with a similar degree of seriousness, to the *Tom Sawyer* passage.

Other works in the series which received positive reports also contain unsuppressed advocations of criminal activity. In *Guillermo artista de cine* (no.24), for example, William meets a young girl, Angela, who for somewhat complicated reasons wishes to prevent the fiancé of her schoolmistress from attending a Conservative party function. William claims, and then begins to believe, that he is capable of exercising power over other people by mysterious means. He thus promptly offers to kidnap the man in question, and is encouraged in his enterprise by Angela:

-¡Oh, Guillermo!- exclamó Angela. -¿Has raptado gente a menudo?

La admiración de sus ojos negros se le subió a la cabeza a Guillermo que miró a su alrededor con aire furtivo. (p.122)

It is of course possible to argue that the element of fantasy in this episode, for which no suppressions were proposed, is so manifest that it can hardly be deemed to advocate actual criminal behaviour. This is not so, however, in the case of an episode in *Guillermo amaestrador de perros* (no.23), in which William's elder sister Ethel entrusts him with the task of stealing a vase from a friend. Ethel had previously given the vase to her friend as a gift. Unfortunately, Ethel herself had been given the vase by her Godmother, who is about to visit the Brown household, thus possibly discovering Ethel's lack of affection for the gift. Ethel resorts to enlisting her brother's criminal assistance in the matter because she is well aware of his expertise in such matters: 'Como los delincuentes de los bajos fondos se vuelven a pedir ayuda a los criminales profesionales en tiempo de crisis, así Ethel iba a pedir ayuda a Guillermo' (proofs, p.168).

The scene in which Ethel explains William's mission to him reveals the disingenuousness of both, in a manner which subverts both the notion of childhood innocence, and that of the implicit rectitude of figures who exercise influence over the child:

-Claro que no debes robarlo bajo ningún pretexto,- le dijo [Ethel a Guillermo] con aire de virtud, esperando sin embargo que él no se detuviera ante nada.

-Claro que no lo robaré,- replicó Guillermo. -Yo no digo que no lo coja ... prestado. (p.169)

This scene would seem to contradict directly Item 2(e) of the *Reglamento*, which proscribed allusions to 'el robo', 'la astucia' and 'la hipocresía' amongst other things.

The following chapter of *Guillermo amaestrador de perros*, entitled 'El mal propósito de Guillermo', constitutes further evidence that *William* was treated with somewhat greater leniency than *Tom Sawyer* with regard to representations of juvenile criminality. In this chapter, William resolves to make a 'bad resolution' at New Year:

-¿Te refieres a ser desobediente, alborotador, o sucio, o algo por el estilo?- dijo Enrique.

-¡Cielos, no!- exclamó Guillermo.- ¡Nada tan aburrido como eso! Seré *verdaderamente* malo. Lo mismo que la gente que sale en los periódicos.

-¿Un asesino?- preguntó Pelirrojo asombrado.

-N-no,- dijo Guillermo.- No quiero ser un asesino porque los ahorcan. Sería jugador si supiera como se hace... A un hombre que conocía mi padre le metieron en la cárcel por estafar a una compañía, pero tampoco sé como se hace eso.

-¿Qué harás entonces?- preguntó Pelirrojo.

Guillermo reflexionó unos instantes.

-Robar es bastante fácil,- dijo al fin. -Creo que seré ladrón.

(Emphasis as in proofs, p.208)

William's desire to become a robber is only the most obvious of several potentially objectionable features in this passage. The fact that William rejects other more sophisticated but equally disreputable activities such as gambling or fraud only because he lacks the knowledge to be successful at them can hardly have counted in favour of the passage in the censor's eyes. More scandalous still is William's rejection of murder on the merely pragmatic basis that it carries the death penalty, rather than on grounds of moral conviction. The presence of the exact verb, 'ahorcar', which was modified to 'condenar' in the Plan version of *Tom Sawyer* might seem to constitute a further objection, particularly since the context, capital punishment, is identical in both cases.

All of these possible objections are compounded by the fact that William's criminal aspirations are quite explicitly not part of a fantasy scenario derived from fictional literature or some other imaginative source. William reiterates more than once that he wishes to emulate the real exploits of genuine, adult criminals. Firstly, when Henry suggests that William should steal Hubert Lane's train set, the eponymous hero replies:

-N-no,- dijo al fin de mala gana. -Me gustaría, pero voy a ser uno de *verdad*. Un ladrón de *verdad*. No voy a robar juguetes a los niños. Voy a robar las cosas que la gente roba en los periódicos. Joyas y cosas por el estilo. (Emphasis as in proofs, p.210)

Later, William steals what he thinks to be a valuable object, in fact an ear-trumpet, owing to a confusion concerning a reference to a 'Whistler'. Ginger suggests selling the object in a toyshop, a proposition met with indignation by William: '-No,- exclamó Guillermo irritado. -Os digo que es *auténtico*. No es un juguete. Es una cosa de persona mayor, y yo igual que un ladrón mayor' (emphasis as in proofs, p.220).

It is therefore evident that the mitigating element of play cited by the censor of the Nausica edition of *Tom Sawyer* does not apply in this case. It is perhaps significant, however, that William explicitly renounces his criminal vocation (though only on pragmatic grounds) at the end of the episode: 'Los duques tienen el dinero que les dejaron sus padres y los ladrones lo consiguen robando, pero nosotros no somos duques y ya he intentado ser ladrón y no da resultado'.

In *Tom Sawyer*, on the other hand, the boys' initial renunciation of a life of adventure outside the law is only implicit, since they quickly become homesick and return to St. Petersburg. Furthermore, their criminal aspirations resurface at the end of the novel, when they toy again with the idea of becoming pirates, before deciding to form a band of robbers. The unresolved nature of this project was explicitly alluded to by the censor of the 1960 FHER edition (no.23) who remarked that 'al final de la novela proyectan hacerse ladrones y formar una banda, lo cual se deja en el aire, sin saber si lo van a realizar o no'.

Once again, however, it is worth examining this final episode of the novel a little more closely in order to discover to what extent the boys' criminal ambitions are presented as real or merely part of their imaginative world. Before the final scene in which the formation of a band of robbers is mooted, Huck has been in the care of the Widow Douglas, who has attempted to civilize him in a variety of ways:

The widow's servants kept him clean and neat, combed and brushed, and they bedded him nightly in unsympathetic sheets that had not one little spot or stain which he could press to his heart and know for a friend. He had to eat with knife and fork; he had to use napkin, cup and plate; he had to learn his book; he had to go to church; he had to talk so properly that speech was become insipid in his mouth; whithersoever he turned, the bars and shackles of civilization shut him in and bound him hand and foot. (p.177)

When the two companions meet, Huck recounts his misery to Tom, and asks him to intercede with the widow in order to release him from his bondage:

'Tom, I wouldn't ever got into all this trouble if it hadn't a ben for that money; now you just take my sheer of it along with yourn, and gimme a ten-center sometimes - not many times, becuz I don't give a dern for a thing 'thout it's tollable hard to git - and you go and beg off for me with the widder.' (p.178)

Tom attempts to persuade the former destitute to persevere, clearly believing that Huck will ultimately benefit from learning to live in society: 'If you try this thing a while longer you'll come to like it' (p.178). The scene continues:

'Like it!' Yes - the way I'd like a hot stove if I was to set on it long enough. No, Tom, I won't be rich, and I won't live in them cussed smothery houses. I like the woods, and the river, and hogshhead, and I'll stick to 'em too. Blame it all! just as we'd got guns, and a cave, and all just fixed to rob, here this dern foolishness has got to come up and spile it all!'

Tom saw his opportunity:

'Looky here, Huck, being rich ain't going to keep me back from turning robber.'

'No! Oh, good licks, are you in real dead-wood earnest, Tom?'

'Just as dead earnest as I'm a-sitting here. But, Huck, we can't let you into the gang if you ain't respectable, you know'.

With the promise of future adventure secured, Huck pledges to return to the Widow Douglas, initially for a month. In his final speech in the novel, he declares that 'I'll stick to the widder till I rot, Tom; and if I git to be a reg'lar ripper of a robber, and everybody talking 'bout it, I reckon she'll be proud she snaked me in out of the wet' (p.179).

In context, therefore, it is patently obvious that Tom uses the plan to form a band of robbers merely as a means of ensuring that Huck will continue his painful process of integration into conventional domestic and communal life. That the protagonist does this consciously is evident from the telling line 'Tom saw his opportunity'. At the very worst, Tom is shown to be a liar in this scene, since it is very probable he is not 'in real dead-wood earnest' at all when he claims he will pursue the criminal vocation: only a little earlier, Judge Thatcher had mapped out a distinguished career for Tom as 'a great lawyer or a great soldier' (p.176), a plan Tom does not oppose (though neither does he endorse it).

As elsewhere in the novel, such as when Tom and Huck discuss marriage (pp.197-198, above), the superficially unorthodox implications of this scene are thus

undermined by a subtextual scheme which in fact tends to assert a message which is both humane and in agreement with orthodox tenets. The criminal aspirations objected to by the censors of the Nausica and FHER (nos.3, 23) editions are the merest pretext for revealing Tom's desire to see his comrade renounce his wayward lifestyle in order to embrace society. This desire is particularly moving because it is made clear earlier in the novel that Tom, like all the other boys, is attracted by Huck's 'gaudy outcast condition' (p.35). The fact that he latterly wishes to see Huck renounce this condition reflects the maturity Tom has acquired through his experiences in the novel. Tell-tale signs such as the marriage conversation have gradually revealed to him the ultimate loneliness of Huck's true estate. His taste of genuine 'adventure' in witnessing the murder and becoming lost with Becky in McDougal's Cave have taught him of the real dangers which lurk beyond the frontiers of organized society. His attempt to snare Huck into further efforts at integration, using adventurous high jinks as bait, strongly suggests that Tom himself is now consciously aware of the difference between the fantasy world inhabited by the boy he has lately been, and which is still inhabited by Huck, and the real world in which freedom has to be compromised and convention observed for the sake of the greater good.

The fact that the censor of the full-length Nausica edition, particularly, felt that the superficial advocacy of criminality in this episode was not outweighed by the human considerations underlying it again reflects the orthodox conviction that young readers were incapable of apprehending the subtextual nuances of a text (or alternatively, that the censors themselves were incapable of appreciating such nuances). In the case of the considerably abridged FHER edition, it is possible that the allusion to Tom's motive has been removed, thus causing his criminal aspirations to appear genuine, or at least unsubverted by contextual considerations.

In summary, the fact that the criminal fantasies at the end of *Tom Sawyer* were objected to at all, and yet William's strenuous efforts to become 'un ladrón de verdad' were not may thus reflect a crucial difference between the two episodes: William's ultimate renunciation of robbery is explicit, whereas the features of the narrative which undermine the reality of Tom's ostensible criminal ambitions are subtextual, implicit. It also seems probable that the orthodox discomfort with the more playful criminal aspirations of Tom and his friends was exacerbated by the general disapproval of *Tom*

*Sawyer* as a children's work, which led to additional censorship rigour when it was viewed as specifically intended for a juvenile readership. Conversely, the growing conviction that *William* was ultimately harmless, because of the lack of adult elements comparable to those of *Tom Sawyer*, meant that the censors were more disposed to view the series as mere entertaining escapism, in which any criminal aspiration or activity could be dismissed as childish mischief.

## **Conclusion**

The censorship history of *Tom Sawyer*, particularly, tends to demonstrate that violence and criminality were particular concerns in the area of children's books, and that they remained concerns until the end of the regime and beyond. It also suggests that incidences of objection to, and suppression of, violent and criminal allusions probably increased generally towards the end of the regime, as works containing such allusions were specifically placed in the category of children's literature.

With regard to violence particularly, it appears that a series of factors affected the Francoist censor's response to violent descriptions in children's works. Firstly, the degree of conformity to orthodox tenets manifested by the narrative overall seems to have been the overriding criterion for judging the permissibility of violent episodes. Secondly, in cases where any implicit condemnation of the violence itself was not considered sufficiently obvious, as may well have been the case with *Tom Sawyer*, a lower threshold of tolerance is likely to have obtained. In such cases, although violence was not necessarily eliminated altogether, the permissible level of explicitness of the violent descriptions themselves seems to have been lower. Thirdly, a fantastic setting could sometimes mitigate evocations of horror or violence in the eyes of the censors, but this factor seems to have interacted in a complex fashion with entirely subjective considerations of taste and literary value. The precedent acquired by a given work within the Francoist censorship apparatus also probably had a bearing on the censors' response to violent or macabre episodes recounted in it. Finally with regard to violence and terror, it is probable that these elements in a work were considered especially pernicious when they were evoked in descriptions of acts considered to be criminal.

Turning to criminal acts in children's works, the evidence suggests that representations of children adopting criminal roles for the purposes of play were generally considered permissible. In cases where the ludic element was dubious or definitely missing, however, it seems likely that the child had to be shown suffering the consequences of his or her actions, or repenting, if the episode was to be considered tolerable. This accords with the prohibition on criminal acts 'sin la debida consecuencia de reprobación' in Section 9(a) of the *Reglamento*. The addition of a moralizing coda to the episode in which Tom deceitfully claims his Bible prize in Llovet's version (p.240, above), tends to confirm the importance of showing explicitly that the child learnt from his or her errant ways, whether these were strictly illegal or merely deceitful. One censor's specific objection to the fact that William was rewarded for his mischief involving Aunt Emily (p.233, above) is another example of the same principle being applied.

Generally speaking, it seems that any mitigating features of a criminal episode or reference had to be explicit in order to put the censors entirely at ease. If elements which undermined the criminal nature of the episode or reference in question were merely subtextual, the episode or reference could still provoke disapproval, if not outright indignation, on the part of some censors. Even in self-evidently ludic contexts, references in which criminality was recommended in a sufficiently explicit and generalized fashion could provoke orthodox discomfort. Specifically, it seems that the presence of the word 'crimen' in works for children was a particular source of unease.

Finally, the censors' divergent responses to criminal representations in *Tom Sawyer* and *William* respectively, particularly in the later period, tend to confirm the impression that the level of censorship applied in specific categories could oscillate according to the degree of positive precedent enjoyed by a work at a given juncture. This effect is somewhat obscured in this category because of the especially heinous nature of the crimes perpetrated (by Injun Joe) in *Tom Sawyer*, as against the ultimately inconsequential criminal acts portrayed in *William*. Nevertheless, the occasional objections to the instances of criminality involving children in *Tom Sawyer*, in contrast to the lack of objection to such episodes in *William*, seems to be at least partly attributable to the effect of precedent.

## NOTES:

1. *Steppenwolf*, trans. by Basil Creighton, (Harmondsworth, Middlesex and Ringwood, Australia: Penguin, 1973), p.77.
2. The ingredient identified by Gasca which has no equivalent in Section 9(b), 'deificación del héroe invencible', corresponds indirectly to the prohibition in Section 9(d) of 'exaltación [...] del culto desproporcionado y ambicioso de la propia personalidad' and, perhaps more directly, to the proscription in Section 9(h) of 'narraciones fantásticas imbuidas de superstición científica que puedan conducir a sobreestimar el valor de la técnica frente a los valores espirituales'. Though this latter section contains the typically vague and paradoxical formula 'superstición científica', it seems likely that the authors of the legislation had science fiction comicbooks in mind.
3. During the ten years after Franco died, Spain experienced a huge boom in both the indigenous production and the translation of 'hard-boiled' detective fiction. Whilst this was generated by the particular circumstances of the transition, Preston suggests that 'the conditions for its popularity and proliferation were growing' beforehand. Along with the social change and prosperity of the later years of the Franco era cited by Preston, the familiarity of many Spanish readers with less politically engaged or sexually explicit forms of pulp fiction, much of it American, may well also have facilitated the boom. See Paul Preston, 'Materialism and Serie Negra', in *Leeds Papers on Thrillers in the Transition: Novela Negra and Political Change in Spain*, ed. by Rob Rix (Leeds: Trinity and All Saints College, 1992), pp.9-16.
4. As well as those editions already mentioned, the Novaro edition (no.17) also tones down the description of the murder somewhat. Interestingly, the Llovet edition, which contains numerous moralizing additions, renders the scene in full detail, providing further evidence that works considered to contain sufficient pious moralizing were permitted a greater quantity of superficially unorthodox material (see p.153, above).
5. Ramón Sarabia, *A los niños Pláticas y Ejemplos*, (Barcelona, Imprenta Pulcra, [1933]).
6. Anon., *Aventuras de Marmolillo* (Barcelona: Sopena, [n.d.]). The pages of *Marmolillo* are not numbered. In one bibliography, *Marmolillo* is classified as suitable for six to nine year olds (INLE, *Libros infantiles y juveniles* (Madrid: Ministerio de Información y Turismo, 1970), p.38).
7. Walt Disney, *Blanc neiges et les sept nains* [sic], Hachette, 1575-68/17132.
8. Censor Romeu's authorization of an anthology entitled *La novia de la tormenta: Narraciones terroríficas*, submitted by Molino in 1941, suggests that the 'absurdity' of such tales could in fact sometimes be deemed to mitigate any elements of horror they might have aspired to contain:  
Salvo la leyenda de Gustavo Adolfo Bécquer 'El Cristo de la Calavera' incluida en este tomo, las narraciones restantes son a fuerza de querer ser terroríficas solamente risibles y de una literatura muy mediocre. Autorizado 24.9.1941. (Ext.1059/7070)
9. Robert Louis Stevenson, *El extraño caso del doctor Jekyll y el señor Hyde*, Apolo, 6-507/7028 (1942).



10. This unsuppressed illustration can be contrasted directly with the suppression of the words 'el indio Joe nos cortaría el cuello' in the proofs of the 1969 Plan edition of *Tom Sawyer* (no.39, p.13).
11. The reader may recall that the regime also permitted liberal use of violent representations in tales of virile, swashbuckling Spanish heroes such as Roberto Alcázar (see p.102, above).
12. It is notable, nevertheless, that illustrations showing various officers of the law shooting at Injun Joe, though without hitting him, were not considered worthy of suppression in the 1969 Plan edition, despite numerous excisions of violent episodes perpetrated by the Outlaw himself in this version.
13. Alfaro renders the passage as follows:  
 -Pues pasarlo lo mejor que puedan, apresando barcos y quemándolos, cogiendo dinero y enterrándolo en su isla, y matando a todos los tripulantes. (Alfaro, no.9, p.142)  
 The versions of Strack and Santainés include the allusion to ghosts:  
 -¡Oh!, tienen much que hacer: capturan barcos, los queman, roban dinero y lo entierran en horrendos lugares de la isla, donde hay espíritus y cosas para vigilarlo, y matan a todo el mundo en los barcos, y los hacen pasar por una tabla. (Strack, no.42, p.83)  
 -¡Oh! Llevan una vida muy agitada- contestó Tom -: apresan buques y los queman, y cogen el dinero y lo entierran en pavorosos lugares de su isla, donde hay fantasmas y otras cosas que lo vigilan, y matan a todo el mundo en los barcos, haciéndolos pasar por una tabla. (Santainés, no.19, p.74)
14. It appears that the Sima edition was not the only edition submitted after Franco's death on which suppressions were imposed. The typed proofs of FHER's 1977 edition (no.66) also contain suppressions relating to the murder episode (specifically, the words 'asesinato', 'tumba' and 'cementerio' are systematically marked for excision). At first sight this edition appears to be a reprint of FHER's 1960 edition (no.23), since the intended number of pages cited by the publishers is identical, leading one to suspect that the censored proofs may have been brought forward from this previous application. The proofs for the 1977 application nevertheless bear the date '4.1977' on the title page. The nature of the suppressions imposed is also consistent with their having been imposed in the post-Sánchez Bella era, rather than in the Arias Salgado period.

## CONCLUSION

Throughout the present dissertation I have asserted that the Francoist censorship of children's literature differed both in degree and in kind from that of adult literature, and that the foreign character of certain children's works was a particularly significant factor in the way they were censored. The arguments for a special model of censorship in the area of children's literature can be divided into two groups: those pertaining to the evolution of children's literature censorship, and those pertaining to the nature of objections and suppressions in particular censorship categories. These arguments are enumerated below, and further avenues of research which might test and refine the conclusions of the present dissertation are suggested.

With regard to the evolution of children's literature censorship, the most striking discovery from the earlier Francoist period is that an English children's work (the *William* books) encountered severe censorship difficulties at a time when adult English literature was generally prospering in Spain. Objections to works in the series were particularly motivated by their quintessentially English character, and specific allusions were made to the application of special rigour in the area of children's literature. The persecution of the *William* books, which began in 1942 and effectively lasted until 1958, is thus only explicable in terms of the regime's perception of children's literature as an area requiring special vigilance. The revelation that Article Two of the *Orden Ministerial* of 1938, which had the effect of establishing the precedence of Spanish literature over translations, was specifically applied to children's literature lays bare the regime's relatively totalitarian approach to the censorship of children's books.

Turning to the later evolution of *Tom Sawyer* and the *William* books, the principal conclusion concerning the censorship of children's literature in the later Francoist period can be summarized as follows: whilst works which 'descended' from the lofty category of 'classic' work to the level of the mere 'children's book', such as *Tom Sawyer*, appear to have suffered additional censorship, children's works which had acquired positive precedent on the basis that they had always been children's works appear to have suffered much less, or not at all, from the inscription of children's literature as a special category. Clearly, investigation of the censorship histories of other similar works would be necessary in order to confirm and refine this

theory. The picture can only be completed by examining the censorship histories of works belonging to a third category: those which were presented for the first time in the later period, and which had thus accumulated no precedent, either positive or negative.

In contrast to the earlier period, there is no evidence that the foreign provenance of children's works directly affected the attitude of the censors in the later years of the regime, though it can be supposed that it did so indirectly. The extent of this implicit bias can only be determined by examining the censorship histories of children's works by Spanish authors in this period. The question of whether Spanish works in the 'classic' category (such as *Don Quixote*) suffered the same fate as *Tom Sawyer* when the publishers began to market them in editions specifically aimed at children is particularly intriguing. The relative lack of explicitly xenophobic or culturally protectionist sentiments in the censorship reports of the later period again reflects the regime's recognition that the belligerent policy of cultural protectionism it had begun to adopt in the heyday of the Axis powers was as unrealistic as the economic autarky of the post-War period. Just as Spain came to rely on international collaboration, whether in the form of tourism or trade deals, to keep it economically viable, so foreign culture had to be allowed its place in the Spanish marketplace.

As with the earlier period, external factors such as the overall evolution of the regime and of the censorship apparatus for adult books prove to be an unreliable basis on which to predict the actual censorship histories of particular children's works. Opposition to *Tom Sawyer* as a children's work was greatest during two periods in the early to mid-1960s, during the period in office of Manuel Fraga Iribarne. This opposition became less entrenched towards the end of Fraga's mandate, and remained at a constant level until the end of Alfredo Sánchez Bella's supposedly regressive period in office. The evidence thus suggests that censorship rigour in the area of children's literature, contrary to what one might expect, was somewhat greater in the era of Fraga than during the period in office of his successor, Sánchez Bella. The overall character of the *Ministerio de Información y Turismo*, as determined by the characteristics of the Minister himself, is thus shown to have had a remarkably insignificant effect on the censorship history of this particular work.

Once again, it is only the special conditions of censorship in the area of children's literature, and the special but far from unique characteristics of the work itself, which can explain this evolution. As pressure towards liberalization grew, the tolerated minimum age of *Tom Sawyer's* intended readership was forced downwards. Once a precedent had been set, considerations of consistency dictated that this minimum tolerable age could not be raised again. It is thus clear that from Fraga's period in office onwards the area of effective operation of Francoist censorship began to recede, and that the age of the putative readership was a significant factor in determining the character of this recession: the younger the readers, the more justified the authorities felt in continuing to censor. This reflects the steady erosion of the regime's faith in its own capacity to justify authoritarian intervention in an increasingly democratically inclined society.

As remarked above, the lack of censorship imposed on the *William* books in the later period suggests, however, that children's works or series of works which had accumulated sufficient positive precedent *as children's works* were probably not decisively affected by the additional stringency which resulted from the inscription of children's literature as a category requiring additional vigilance. Particularly from 1960 onwards, children's literature publishing in Francoist Spain, as in other circumstances, was dominated by classic works in more or less adapted editions, and particularly by series of works featuring the same character or characters (Fernández López, pp.126, 130). It can therefore be supposed that the relative impact of precedent on children's literature was proportionally much greater than on adult literature, in which a lower proportion of works are likely to have formed part of a series. The effect of precedent on the regime's response to particular editions of works, or on works which formed part of a series, thus constitutes a further argument for considering the censorship of children's literature as significantly different from that of adult literature.

With regard to the impact of precedent, it is especially important to point out that the regime's response to individual children's works, studied in isolation, may appear surprising in the light of Francoist censorship practice overall, if one fails to recognize that the principle of precedent appears to have applied to whole series of works such as the *William* books. As suggested above, it is only in the light of the series' increasing fame and accumulated positive precedent that the relative lack of

censorship imposed on the later *William* books can be understood. Conversely, it is only the inscription of children's literature as a special category, and the assimilation of classic texts into the category of popular children's books, which allow us to understand why the positive precedent acquired by *Tom Sawyer* in the earlier period failed to rescue it from serious censorship difficulties towards the end of the Franco era.

Given the disproportionately large impact of precedent in the area of children's literature, it is evident that the censorship of many children's works is best understood diachronically: it is only by reference to the censorship history of previous editions or other works in the series that one can properly contextualize the censors' assessment of an individual work or edition. Future research should bear in mind the fact that the history of a children's work under Franco may have been rather less determined by the wider political juncture or even by the overall character of the ministry at the time, and rather more by the peculiar internal dynamics of the censorship apparatus for children's literature. As well as the effects of precedent, the explicit inscription of children's literature as a category requiring different, and ultimately greater, censorship during the 1950s and 1960s should be borne in mind. As suggested above with regard to *Tom Sawyer*, this may well have had the effect of concentrating the regime's censorship zeal, and its remaining censorship powers, within a single area - children's literature - whilst it was steadily forced to weaken its grip on other areas of publishing. The question of whether an edition or work submitted for censorship was being assessed as a children's publication is thus crucial to an understanding of the censors' response to it.

Moving away from the diachronic picture, some consideration of the overall concept of censorship applied to children's literature generally is relevant, before we consider the conclusions to be drawn from individual categories of suppression. In this regard, the most significant finding of the present dissertation is that the concept of censorship applied to the *William* books during their era of persecution was different in kind from that usually adopted by the Francoist censors. In practice, Francoist censorship tended to involve localized excision of words or phrases, when these were felt to transgress in an explicit manner according to specific categories of taboo. If the total number of excisions required was felt to render the work unpublishable, it might

be suppressed altogether. Outright suppression might also be imposed if the principal theme or thesis of a work belonged to a taboo category such as left-wing political thought. The *William* books, however, represent the only known instance of a work being suppressed merely on the basis of the alien world-view which informs the narrative. The fact that the only evidence for this approach thus far discovered relates to the censorship of a children's work tends to confirm that the regime's more extreme tendencies were manifested in its control of literature for the young. Further research would establish whether this more totalitarian mode of censorship was applied to other foreign children's works. If it emerges that it was not, and that the *William* books were singled out for special persecution, the reasons for this would be equally interesting to ascertain.

Let us now turn to the conclusions which can be drawn from the analysis of specific categories of censorship. Firstly, it is evident that religious censorship is the dominant category in the censorship of children's literature overall. The censors' response to Protestant elements in children's works seems to have been more extreme than in the case of adult literature, and illustrates a general principle of Francoist censorship in the area of children's literature: the censors attributed very little appreciation of literary point of view to Spanish child readers. Mockery of Protestantism was evidently considered proscribable in children's works, but not in many adult works, reflecting the particular emphasis on encouraging obedience of authority, above all else, in the young.

Sexual or romantic allusions in children's books were also habitually suppressed, and a further specific divergence between the censors' response to books considered to be for children and those not so considered is illustrated by orthodox concerns in this area regarding *Tom Sawyer*: the censors repeatedly objected to the mere fact that a juvenile romantic liaison was portrayed at all when the work was deemed to be aimed at a child readership; no such objections had been raised when the same work was considered to be for adult consumption.

Whilst the suppression of sexual or romantic involvement between juvenile characters in children's books seems to have been close to systematic, in the area of adult literature the decision to suppress a particular allusion was determined by the degree of explicitness of the allusion. This principle of explicitness appears to have

applied also to two categories of censorship, particularly, in the area of children's literature, namely violence and the mockery or subversion of authority. Thus objection to violent scenes tended to be exacerbated by the degree of macabre detail in the description, and ridicule of authority figures was considered especially objectionable if a specific insult was involved. In the case of subversive or anti-authoritarian references, the degree of generality of the allusion, as well as its degree of explicitness, appears to have been significant: if the mockery of prestigious figures was aimed at a whole class of such figures (doctors, teachers, kings, etc.), it was considered more proscribable than if it only tended to discredit a single authority figure. The orthodox attitude towards allusions to crime, and particularly the criminal aspirations of children, also seems to have been affected to some extent by the explicitness principle: whilst criminal intentions in the context of play tended to provoke unease rather than outright indignation, the word 'crimen' seems to have been a particular source of orthodox discomfort.

The censors' unsophisticated response to texts, or the lack of sophistication they attributed to child readers, is demonstrated by the fact that the explicitness principle was not mediated by considerations of point of view. Thus a violent, criminal or anti-authoritarian allusion was frequently considered proscribable or objectionable even in cases where the structure of the surrounding narrative had the effect of condemning or subverting the violent, criminal or anti-authoritarian sentiment or action described in the allusion.

It should be pointed out, however, that the tolerance towards certain categories of allusion fluctuated according to the censors' overall opinion of a given work or edition, which as we have seen was in turn affected by precedent. Thus certain types of allusion which were considered acceptable in the later *William* books were deemed objectionable in later editions of *Tom Sawyer* and *Huck Finn*. The effect of precedent on particular categories of allusion seems to be particularly perceptible outside the areas of religion and sexuality. Taboos in these areas appear to have been observed with relative consistency from work to work, and to have been less dependent on the censors' overall response to the individual work, or on considerations of precedent. These two categories can thus be considered the 'cardinal' or 'core' censorship categories of children's literature censorship.

Turning specifically to the question of further research, it seems obvious that Elena Fortún's *Celia* books are a good Spanish analogue of the *William* books, particularly.<sup>1</sup> A full examination of the content of *Celia*, and of how it was received by the censors during the regime, would help to clarify several questions. Firstly, the degree to which the foreign provenance of a work militated against it in the earlier period might be ascertained by comparing the respective responses to *William* and *Celia*. Relatedly, the extent to which the foreign provenance of a work may have counted *in its favour* in the later period, as certain foreign works came to be considered as harmlessly exotic, might also be investigated. It is hard to imagine that the Spanish children of *Celia*'s world were permitted the same divergence from the orthodox child model as William and his Outlaws. More generally, such an examination would help to define the permissible limits of all unorthodox allusions or portrayals *when they appeared in a Spanish setting*. Lastly, because the eponymous protagonist of *Celia* is female, comparison of the series with *William* might also shed light on questions of gender representations in children's literature under the regime.

An examination of other English or foreign works published in Spain in the era is also essential in order to test the precise impact of foreignness on the censors' response to children's works. In this regard, Fernández López's work (see Chapter 2, note 16 for reference) is of considerable value, since it provides a detailed analysis of the literature translated from English in Franco's Spain. Whilst Fernández López does not focus specifically on the implications of censorship, her analysis of translation conditions and techniques is useful, and her statistical analysis of works published serves as an invaluable guide to which English authors for children were most popular during the era. In the light of this analysis, it would seem particularly useful to study the works of Enid Blyton, published in vast quantities in Spain, though perhaps significantly only in the later period (see table in Fernández López, p.147). The censorship history of Anthony Buckeridge's *Jennings* series, several volumes of which were published by Molino in the late 1950s (Fernández López, p.130), might also be interestingly comparable to the trajectory of the *William* series, given the similarity of milieu in the two series.

The censorship histories of equivocal or controversial children's works such as Kenneth Grahame's *The Wind in the Willows*, Charles Kingsley's *The Water Babies*



or Jonathan Swift's *Gulliver's Travels* would also seem especially pertinent to the matters raised in the present dissertation. This would apply particularly to the later period when such works may have been assimilated into the popular children's fiction category having previously been marketed as 'classics', as evidently happened to *Tom Sawyer* and *Huckleberry Finn*. The censors' response to the works of Louisa May Alcott may also shed further light on the regime's attitude to foreign representations of gender.<sup>2</sup>

Another possible area of interest is the regime's use of English literature in the teaching of the English language. The choice of works, their adaptation, the censorship imposed on them and how they were taught all constitute vital additional information on the regime's education policy and its intersection with foreign culture.

Finally, with regard to further research, communication with former employees of the censorship apparatus might help to solve some of the enigmas generated by the vast, largely untapped documentary resources held in the Archive at Alcalá de Henares. Whilst a full picture of Francoist censorship can only emerge from an exhaustive collation of the tens of thousands of documents held in the Archive, there can be no doubt that the testimony of those directly involved in the generation of this documentation would be likely to produce information of inestimable value for future researchers. Obtaining such testimony is clearly a sensitive matter, since the undeclared amnesty extended to many adherents of the regime in order to facilitate the transition to democracy has not, generally speaking, left in its wake an ethos conducive to frank discussion of such matters. However, it seems important that an attempt should be made to find exceptions to the large numbers of Francoist public functionaries who would rather their recollections of life in the service of the regime died with them. Only direct communication with such people might help to elucidate questions concerning the hierarchy of the censorship apparatus, the degree of communication between individual censors, and the extent to which precedent was a conscious consideration; in short, those factors which can only be understood in the light of the day-to-day conditions of those charged with the ideological and cultural welfare of the Spanish populace.

## NOTES:

1. Publication of at least one work by Elena Fortún (pseudonym of Encarnación Aragonese Urquijo) was initially prohibited under Article Two of the Ministerial Order of 1938 (*Cuchifritín el hermano de Celia*, Aguilar, K-698/6486 (1940)). Whilst no information is given in the censorship record as to why this happened, documentation relating to later applications suggests that it may have been because the author was suspected of being a Republican sympathizer. The file relating to the application to publish the same work in 1943 (917-43/7101) contains a letter, signed by Manuel Aguilar and dated 9 April 1943, in which the publisher testifies to Fortún's good character, and explains the difficult circumstances surrounding her recruitment for Republican propaganda purposes. Aguilar's defence of the author was evidently successful, since numerous editions of her work were subsequently published in the Franco era.
2. The Editorial Juventud's application to publish Alcott's *Little Men (Hombrecitos*; Ext.1765/7073 (1943)) received the following report: 'Es un libro que concretamente no tiene nada tachable pero a través del cual se defiende la coeducación, cosa opuesta a todos los principios pedagógicos. Denegada. 30.3.43'. This report seems to confirm the notion that a more 'global' mode of censorship, according to which the overall ethos or setting of a work could disqualify it, was applied to children's literature in this period.

**Appendix A: The *William* books in Spain (1938-1981)**

	<b><i>Title</i> Year Ref</b>	<b>Resolution</b>	<b><i>English Title</i> (Year) Censorship Report</b>
<b>1</b>	<b><i>G. el genial</i></b> 1940 Ext.832/7068 1941 2-842/6744	Autorizada importación de 1.000 ejemplares "	<b><i>William the Fourth</i></b> (1924) 1940: <i>Valor literario:</i> Suficiente <i>Valor documental:</i> El adecuado a este tipo de obra. <i>Otras observaciones:</i> Novela de aventuras apropiadas a jóvenes con rasgos de ingenio. Moral. Puede publicarse. Aut. 10.12.40 1941: <i>Valor literario:</i> Bueno <i>Otras observaciones:</i> Es un libro de cuentos morales muy gracioso. Puede autorizarse.
<b>2</b>	<b><i>G. el incomprendido</i></b> 1940 Ext.777/7066 1941 1-77/6762	"	<b><i>More William</i></b> (1922) 1940: <i>Valor literario:</i> Corriente <i>Otras observaciones:</i> Ninguna 1941: <i>Valor literario:</i> Positivo. <i>Otras observaciones:</i> Libro de un humorismo desconcertante, complicado, extraño, pero entretenido. Literariamente es muy original. [Lector: Antonio Reyes Huertas]
<b>3</b>	<b><i>G. el conquistador</i></b> 1941 Ext.461/7068 1942 1-464/6780	"	<b><i>William the Conqueror</i></b> (1926) 1941: <i>Valor literario:</i> Apreciable <i>Otras observaciones:</i> Aventuras muy amenas y bien compuestas, para niños. Aut. 16.6.41 1942: Aut. 7.1.42
<b>4</b>	<b><i>G. hace de las suyas</i></b> 1941 Ext.1105/7070 1942 6-862/7036	Autorizada importación de 1.000 ej. <b>Denegada publicación de 10.000 ej.</b>	<b><i>William Again</i></b> (1923) 1941: <i>Valor literario:</i> Bueno <i>Otras observaciones:</i> Nueva serie de aventuras de Guillermo, tan amenas y graciosas como las anteriores. Aut. 8.11.41 1942: Estimo este libro nada educativo. Propongo no se autorice. Den. 28.11.42

The *William* books in Spain (1938-1981)

5	<p><b><i>Los apuros de G.</i></b>  3.1942  2-327/6824  10.1942  6-514/7028</p>	<p>Denegada  publicación  de 8.000 ej.  Autorizada  publicación  de 10.000 ej.</p>	<p><b><i>William in Trouble</i></b> (1927)  3.1942:  Andrés: Libro de lecturas para niños traducido del inglés y con absoluta mentalidad inglesa. No deja de tener 'humour' pero creo que es preferible que los niños españoles lean lecturas españolas. 27.2.42  Peña: Un libro de lecturas para niños que no posee nada malo ni nada bueno. Propongo su no aprobación. 6.3.42  Conde: Por su carácter de cuento infantil traducido del inglés, aunque no se halla nada censurable en el mismo, opinamos debe darse preferencia en esta clase de publicaciones a las netamente españolas y suspender aquellas mientras duren las circunstancias de escasez de papel. 19.3.42  Den. 6.3.42  10.1942: Cuento infantil. Puede pasar. Aut. 25.10.42</p>
6	<p><b><i>Travesuras de G.</i></b>  1942  2-319/6824</p>	<p>Denegada  publicación  de 8.000 ej.</p>	<p><b><i>Just William</i></b> (1922)  Panero:  <i>Valor literario:</i> Escaso  <i>Otras observaciones:</i> Es una serie de narraciones para niños, escritas con ingenuidad y sencillez. No creemos haya en ellas nada reprochable.  Conde:  <i>Valor literario:</i> Ninguno  <i>Otras observaciones:</i> Se trata de un cuento infantil que, aunque por su tema no se halla nada censurable, tiene el inconveniente de ser una traducción del inglés, y por lo tanto el carácter y las costumbres extrañas al niño español. Dada la escasez de papel opinamos debe darse la preferencia, en esta clase de publicaciones, a los libros infantiles españoles. 19.3.42  Den. 11.3.42</p>
7	<p><b><i>G. el proscrito</i></b>  1942  6-515/7028  1944  6086-44/7517</p>	<p>Denegada  publicación  de 10.000 ej.  [Denegada  publicación  de 8.000 ej.]</p>	<p><b><i>William the Outlaw</i></b> (1927)  2 nov 1942: Cuento infantil traducido del inglés. No encontramos nada que impida su publicación. [Lector: Conde]  3 nov 1942: Cuento infantil de marcado carácter inglés, que desentona con la formación de nuestra infancia, por lo que estimamos no debe aprobarse. [Lector: Conde]  Den. 5.11.42</p>

The *William* books in Spain (1938-1981)

cont	<b><i>G. el proscrito</i></b> 1942 6-515/7028 1944 6086-44/7517	Denegada publicación de 10.000 ej. [Denegada publicación de 8.000 ej.]	1944: Esta Delegación Nacional ha resuelto suspender el despacho de las solicitudes que tenga presentadas esa Editorial Molino durante el plazo de un mes de la fecha de esta comunicación. [Carta a Molino del Delegado Nacional de Propaganda, 31.10.44]
8	<b><i>G. el organizador</i></b> 1943 Ext.1977/7075 1949 5139-49/8883	Denegada importación de 1.000 ej. Denegada publicación de 8.000 ej.	<i>Still William</i> (1925) 1943: <i>¿Ataca al dogma o a la moral?</i> Para niños, irreverente. <i>Valor literario:</i> Flojo <i>Razones circunstanciales que aconsejan una u otra decisión:</i> Aventuras de niños traviesos, con espíritu quizás impertinente para España, por exceso de 'americanismo sajón' y porque el obispo, sacerdotes, son 'pastores' protestantes. Se propone la suspensión. Den. 6.8.43 1949: Comprobado el expediente no. Ext. 1977 está suspendido el 6.8.43. Den. 21.10.49
9	<b><i>G. el bueno</i></b> 1958 5638-48/12228	Autorizada publicación de 8.000 ej.	<i>William the Good</i> (1928) Narración novelística de las infantiles aventuras de 'Tres Mosqueteros' (Guillermo, Roberto y el Pelirrojo), en estrecha colaboración con Ethel, la hermana de Guillermo, y con una cotorra de la que es dueña la tía del Pelirrojo, la cual ocupa puesto destacado en estas travesuras inocentes observadas con escrutadora mirada psicológico-analítica. Autorizable. Aut. 10.12.58
10	<b><i>G. el malo</i></b> 1959	Autorizada publicación de 10.000 ej.	<i>William the Bad</i> (1930) Ingeniosa novela donde se narran las disparatadas aventuras de Guillermin, el niño arriesgado que, influenciado por las lecturas y el cine se resuelve a imitar y aun superar las proezas de su abuelo español Don Quijote. Nada censurable. Puede ser autorizada. [sin fecha; Lector: Palacios]
11	<b><i>G. empresario</i></b> 1959 2589-59/12427	"	<i>William</i> (1929) Aventuras y ocurrencias de Guillermo - una especie de Jaimito - aficionado a la lectura de novelas policíacas. Puede autorizarse. Aut. 13.6.59

The *William* books in Spain (1938-1981)

12	<b><i>G. y el animal del espacio</i></b> 1959 3493-59/12485	"	<b><i>William and the Space Animal</i></b> (1956) Aventuras. Guillermo es un simpático personajillo que interesado en las aventuras que lee o ve en el cine intenta realizarlas él en plan de protagonista. Esta vez sitúa su campo de acción en el espacio donde juega con astros, monstruos y animales. Nada que oponer. Aut. 14.8.59 [Lector: Moreno de Munguía]
13	<b><i>G. el atareado</i></b> 1959 4261-59/12536	"	<b><i>William's Crowded Hours</i></b> (1931) Novela para jóvenes. Diabluras de Guillermo y sus tres amigos inseparables. Continuación de una novela de series. Puede autorizarse. Aut. 10.10.59
14	<b><i>G. el pirata</i></b> 1959 6367-59/12612	"	<b><i>William the Pirate</i></b> (1932) Novela de aventuras con la narración de las ingeniosas aventuras del protagonista, Guillermo el fantástico, acompañado de sus tres inseparables amigos. Todo ingenuo e inofensivo. Aut. 18.12.59
15	<b><i>G. el rebelde</i></b> 1960 59-60/12629	"	<b><i>William the Rebel</i></b> (1933) Episodios eslabonados de la cadena de disparatadas aventuras a las que se siente empujado el protagonista, el travieso Guillermin, influenciado por fantásticas lecturas y por la admiración que en él despiertan los héroes de la pantalla. Aut. 15.1.60 [Lector: Palacios]
16	<b><i>G. el gángster</i></b> 1960 986-60/12683	"	<b><i>William the Gangster</i></b> (1934) Ninguna nota de desfavorable censura para esta novela de aventuras infantiles, de que es protagonista el travieso Guillermo, un niño que trae loca a su familia y amigos con sus continuas diabluras, que en este caso entran en la nueva fase de imitar a los gángsters, sugestionado por el cine y las lecturas, fracasando en su disparatada empresa. Autorizable. Aut. 29.2.60 [Lector: Palacios]
17	<b><i>G. detective</i></b> 1960 2777-60/12788	"	<b><i>William the Detective</i></b> (1935) Una nueva aventura del famoso personaje infantil, Guillermo, esta vez metido en andanzas detectivescas. Nada que oponer, como los relatos anteriores. Aut. 4.6.60 [Lector: Melaidó]

The William books in Spain (1938-1981)

18	<b><i>G. el amable</i></b> 1960 4050-60/12891	"	<b><i>Sweet William</i></b> (1936) [Principio del informe ilegible] de las protagonizadas por el travieso aventurero infantil y sus dos camaradas inseparables. Puede autorizarse. Aut. 9.8.60
19	<b><i>G. y los pigmeos</i></b> 1960 5208-60/12975	"	<b><i>William the Showman</i></b> (1937) Narraciones en las que se continúa la interminable serie de aventuras del ingenuo joven Guillermo, influido para ello por sus lecturas fantásticas y películas disparatadas que él trata de traducir a la realidad de su vida de muchacho. En este tomo le vemos preferentemente preocupado por el apostolado benéfico que la maestra Milton propone a la madre de Guillermo, consistente en adoptar a niños de familias pobres llevándoles a éstos a las casas de familias acomodadas. Con todo lo que tiene de plausible y caritativo tal plan, falta la prudencia y ello da al traste con tan felices iniciativas: fracasa. Aut. 15.10.60 [Lector: Palacios]
20	<b><i>G. y los mellizos</i></b> 1961 2177-61/13275		[English title unknown] Ingeniosas travesuras de Guillermo y sus inseparables amigos. Pueden autorizarse. Aut. 21.4.61
21	<b><i>G. y el cerdo premiado</i></b> 1961 2866-61/13325	"	[English title unknown] Relatos infantiles. Guillermo es un muchacho graciosamente avisado que protagoniza hasta diez cuentos cuya acción se desarrolla en el ambiente familiar en que el muchacho vive. Puede autorizarse. Aut. 18.5.61 [Lector: Moreno de Munguía]
22	<b><i>G. el luchador</i></b> 1961 7063-61/13667	"	<b><i>William the Dictator</i></b> (1938) Novela de aventuras infantiles, con la continuación de las que corre el intrépido Guillermo, empujado a ellas por su espíritu curioso e independiente, que quiere 'vivir su vida' de voluntario vagabundeo en plena naturaleza. Autorizable. Aut. 19.12.61 [Lector: Palacios]

The *William* books in Spain (1938-1981)

23	<b><i>G. amaestrador de perros</i></b> 1962 1955-62/13885	"	<b><i>William's Bad Resolution</i></b> (1956) Nueva aventura del popular Guillermo y sus amigos, ahora intentando organizar prácticas de salvamento y protección de defensa civil en caso de guerra. Nada que oponer. Aut. 17.4.62
24	<b><i>G. artista de cine</i></b> 1962 4706-62/14119	"	<b><i>William the Film Star</i></b> (1956) Serie de aventuras infantiles dirigidas por Guillermo Brown, secundado por el Pelirrojo, al que la pandilla contraria procura hacer trastadas, pero en las que el protagonista sale vencedor o sabe sacar algún provecho de su derrota. Aut. 11.9.62 [Lector: Batanero]
25	<b><i>G. y el cohete a la luna</i></b> 1963 5036-63/14736	"	<b><i>William and the Moon Rocket</i></b> (1954) Una nueva aventura de Guillermo, el héroe de la serie de relatos en los que se narran las andanzas, travesuras y quehaceres de dicho personaje infantil y su pandilla. Nada que oponer. Puede autorizarse. Aut. 13.9.63
26	<b><i>G. hace de las suyas</i></b> 1963 5457-63/14770	"	<b><i>William Again</i></b> (1923) 1. Serie de hazañas realizadas por este avisado protagonista adolescente - a la verdad un poco gamberillo, y ello acaso determinaría el dictamen negativo de que fue objeto hace diez años. [Lector: Moreno de Munguía] 2. Un libro de la serie de aventuras de Guillermo que se siente esta vez benefactor de la humanidad y trata de llevar al buen camino a un sabio arqueólogo a quien él cree ladrón y asesino. Se suceden las mil y una travesuras que traen de coronilla a todos los mayores de su alrededor. Aut.17.10.63
27	<b><i>G. el proscrito</i></b> 1963 5456-63/14770	"	<b><i>William the Outlaw</i></b> (1927) 1. Se recopilan en el presente volumen una serie de aventuras del popular adolescente Guillermo y sus compañeros de travesuras que a pesar de haber sido suspendido en el año 1944, no hay nada que oponer a ellas desde el punto de vista del presente dictamen. Puede autorizarse.



The *William* books in Spain (1938-1981)

cont	<b><i>G. el proscrito</i></b> 1963 5456-63/14770	"	2. El presente libro es uno más de la serie de <i>Guillermo</i> en el cual el protagonista y tres amigos forman la pandilla de los 'Proscritos' para planear las más intrépidas aventuras que les liberen del colegio. Tanto mayores como pequeños sufren las consecuencias de tan exaltadas imaginaciones. Puede editarse. Aut. 19.10.63
28	<b><i>G. buscador de tesoros</i></b> 1964 1893-64/15122	"	<b><i>William's Treasure Trove</i> (1962)</b> 1. Divertidas travesuras de Guillermo y sus tres inseparables amigos, quienes sugestionados por las lecturas, pretenden realizar disparatadas empresas en las que fracasan ruidosamente. Puede autorizarse. 2. La pandilla de los Proscritos deliberan sobre la forma de jugar a algo nuevo, y decide ir en busca de tesoros que ocasionan más perjuicios que beneficios. Guillermo siente su fracaso, y se propone hacer una buena obra en favor de un anciano asilado que trata de obtener un empleo con tal de no permanecer inactivo en su residencia. A partir de este momento, se suceden los mayores equívocos y peripecias, dignos de la desbordada imaginación del pequeño protagonista. Puede editarse. Aut. 6.4.64
29	<b><i>G. y la guerra</i></b> 1965 149-65/15791	"	<b><i>William and the Brains Trust</i> (1945)</b> 1. Serie de aventuras infantiles protagonizadas por la pandilla de los 'Proscritos'; trastadas, luchas con pandillas rivales y problemas 'internos'. Sin otra trabazón que la unidad de los protagonistas y ocurrir durante la guerra mundial, en Inglaterra. Tienen alegría sana y vis cómica. Autorizable. [Lector: Batanero] 2. Guillermo, acompañado de 'los Proscritos' decide esta vez servir a la patria tomando parte en los actos organizados a favor de la postguerra. Como de costumbre, los resultados son desastrosos para los mayores, víctimas de la imaginación de Guillermo. 3. Debe suprimirse la frase en rojo, de la página 119. Con la supresión indicada, puede editarse. Aut. [una tachadura] 16.3.65

The *William* books in Spain (1938-1981)

30	<b><i>G. y la bruja</i></b> 1965 5314-65/16445	"	<b><i>William and the Witch</i></b> (1964) Obedientes a la fertil imaginación de Guillermo, 'los Proscritos' provocan una serie de disparatados lances, cuyas víctimas son sus pacíficos vecinos y una recién llegada escultora a la que toman por bruja. Puede editarse. Aut.23.7.65
31	<b><i>G. el incompredido</i></b> 1965 7418-65/16669	"	<b><i>William the Fourth</i></b> (1924) Una vez más Guillermo se lamenta de la incomprensión de los mayores que no ven su 'buena voluntad' y afán de servir a los demás, en los constantes estropicios que ello trae consigo. Suprimir las tachaduras en las páginas 43 y 46. Aut. [con modificaciones] 7.12.65
32	<b><i>G. y los cantantes yeyé</i></b> 1966 4147-66/17410	"	<b><i>William and the Pop Singers</i></b> (1965) 1. Novelitas para niños. Narran travesuras del protagonista. 'C'. Publicables. 2. Nuevamente la desbordada imaginación de Guillermo induce a sus 'Proscritos' a tomar parte en las más disparatadas aventuras en los que los mayores sufren siempre las consecuencias. Puede editarse. Aut. 24.6.66 [Lector: Sartorius]
33	<b><i>Travesuras de G.</i></b> 1968 9103-68/19334	Autorizada publicación de 8.000 ejemplares	<b><i>Just William</i></b> (1922) 1. Después de asistir a una sesión de cine, Guillermo intenta llevar a cabo las aventuras y desventuras del protagonista, que caen sucesivamente como una bomba sobre su familia, su profesora y demás personas allegadas a él. Páginas 115 a 121: Travesura de Guillermo que pasa de la raya. Después de ella es premiado por su padre (suprimir o modificar lo acotado). Páginas 133 a 134: Escena demasiado insinuante protagonizada por una niña de once años (suprimir). Con las correcciones que se indican, podría autorizarse (infantil-juvenil).

The William books in Spain (1938-1981)

cont	<b>Travesuras de G.</b> 1968 9103-68/19334	Autorizada publicación de 8.000 ejemplares	2. Se relatan, muy pormenorizadas, doce aventuras de Guillermo, un niño de once años harto sugestionado por las lecturas y por el cine que ha visto. En rigor, el contenido de las aventuras de Guillermo, entre atolondrado e ingenioso, las escenas de hilaridad y las ironías a que dan lugar ni son recomendables ni contienen aspectos positivos y utilizables para una recta formación infantil, ya que rebasan el marco de sus capacidades. Por atentar seriamente al respeto que merecen los mayores por cualquier muchacho menor, por parte de cualquier niño, debe modificarse - de no suprimirse - parte del capítulo ocho, desde la página 115. Y deben suprimirse, cuando menos, los subrayados en tinta azul de las páginas 116, 117, 118, 121, 133, 134, 171, 173, 175, estas tres últimas páginas referidas a la rata que llevó Guillermo a una Iglesia. Con estas salvedades, puede autorizarse en edición juvenil. Aut. [tachaduras] 19.12.68
34	<b>G. el superhombre</b> 1971 1953-71/123	"	<b>William the Superman</b> (1968) Puede editarse (infantil). Aut. 6.3.71
35	<b>G. y la televisión</b> 1972 1167-72/71	Autorizada publicación de 10.000 ejemplares	<b>William's Television Show</b> (1958) Puede editarse (infantil). Aut. 10.2.72
36	<b>G. aporta su grano de arena</b> 1972 4685-72/311	Autorizada publicación de 8.000 ejemplares	<b>William Does His Bit</b> (1941) Puede editarse. Aut. 27.4.72
37	<b>G. el explorador</b> 1973 9922-73/607	Autorizada publicación de 8.000 ejemplares	<b>William the Explorer</b> (1960) Aut. 17.9.73 [Falta informe]
38	<b>Las aventuras de G. no.1: La dulce damita de blanco</b> 1980 11479-80/257	Autorizada publicación de 30.000 ejemplares	[Falta informe].

The *William* books in Spain (1938-1981)

39	<b><i>Las aventuras de G. no.2: El baile de disfraces</i></b> 1980 12262-80/272	Autorizada publicación de 30.000 ejemplares	[Falta informe].
40	<b><i>G. sigue adelante</i></b> 1981 1542-81/31	"	<b><i>William Carries On</i></b> (1942) Autorizable (infantil). Aut. 12.2.81
41	<b><i>G. y el vagabundo</i></b> 1981 1543/81	"	<b><i>William and the Tramp</i></b> (1952) Autorizable (infantil). Aut.12.2.81
42	<b><i>G. y el jinete enmascarado</i></b> 1981 1544-81/31	"	<b><i>William and the Masked Ranger</i></b> (1966) Autorizable (infantil). Aut. 12.2.81
43	<b><i>G. el revolucionario</i></b> 1981 1545-81/31	Autorizada publicación de 6.000 ejemplares	<b><i>William the Bold</i></b> (1950) Autorizable (infantil). Aut. 12.2.81
44	<b><i>G. el bandido</i></b> 1981 1546/32	"	<b><i>William the Lawless</i></b> (1970) Autorizable (infantil). Aut.12.2.81

**Additional Information:**

1. **No.1:** The original title for *Guillermo el genial* is incorrectly given as *More William* in the 1939 edition. Comparison reveals that *William the Fourth* is in fact the corresponding English text.
2. The translators of the *William* books into Spanish were:-
  - (i) Guillermo López Hipkiss (nos.1-8, 26, 27, 31, 33)
  - (ii) Conchita Peraire del Molino (nos.9, 13, 14, 16, 20-25, 29, 30, 40, 41, 43)
  - (iii) Juan Larraya (no.10)
  - (iv) Jaime Elías (nos.11, 17-19)
  - (v) Magdalena Rodríguez (no.12)
  - (vi) María Dolores Raich (no.15)
  - (vii) Ramón Margalef Llambrich (nos.28, 34-36)
  - (viii) Montserrat Guasch (no.32)
  - (ix) Carlos Unterlohnner Clavaguara (no.37)
  - (x) Esteban Riambau (nos.42, 44)
  - (xi) Angel Julio Gómez de la Segura (nos.38, 39)

3. The proposed sale prices stated by Molino on the censorship documents (or as they appear in relevant volumes of the *Catálogo crítico*) are as follows:

6 pesetas: **nos.1-8**  
20 pesetas: **nos.9-27**  
25 pesetas: **nos.28-33**  
60 pesetas: **nos.34-35**  
70 pesetas: **no.36**  
75 pesetas: **no.37**  
200 pesetas: **nos.38-39**  
300 pesetas: **nos. 40-44**

**Appendix B: Tom Sawyer in Spain (1938-1980)**

No.	Year Pp.	Publ. Exp./Caja	P-run Price	Collection / Character Censorship Report
1.	1941	Espasa Calpe Ext.1121/ 7070	2.500	<b>Colección Austral</b> <i>Valor literario</i> <i>o artístico:</i> Excelente <i>Valor documental:</i> Paisajista <i>Matiz político:</i> Nulo <i>Otras observaciones:</i> Narración lograda de las aventuras de un niño, pero con destino a personas ambientadas en países nórdicos. Interesante. Creemos se puede permitir su difusión. Aut. 24.12.41
2.	1942	Marco 5-165/ 6947	5.000 1	<b>Colección Gráfica</b> Aut. 12.8.42
3.	1943 300	Nausica 7-699/ 7059	2.000	<b>Colección Retablo</b> <i>Valor literario</i> <i>o artístico:</i> De estilo literario ágil. <i>Valor documental:</i> Nulo <i>Matiz político:</i> Ninguno <i>Tachaduras:</i> Páginas 48, 49, 50, 51, 63, 103, 104, 118, 133 <i>Otras observaciones:</i> Obra de ambiente muy norteamericano en la cual se ensalza, en cierto modo, la piratería. Se narran unas aventuras ocurridas a unos muchachos. Al lado de episodios ingenuos se plantean otros, a los que corresponden las tachaduras, que estimamos impropias, teniendo en cuenta que la obra está escrita para que la lean los muchachos. El ideal de los protagonistas es llegar a ser ladrones, objeto que consiguen, aunque un poco en juego, al final de la novela. Aut. 12.1.43
4.	1943	SLC 688/7093	3.000	Autorizado
5.	1943 96	Ameller 1192/7109	5.000	<b>Carácter: Literario</b> <i>Valor literario</i> <i>artístico:</i> Notable <i>Valor documental:</i> Escaso <i>Matiz político:</i> Ninguno <i>Otras observaciones:</i> Magnífica novela de aventuras infantiles. Aut. 26.2.43
6.	1943 296	Molino 4495/7206	12. 000 6	<b>Colección Famosas Novelas</b> <b>Carácter: Literario (Novela)</b> <i>Valor literario</i> <i>o artístico:</i> Bueno, humorismo sano <i>Otras observaciones:</i> Es un libro célebre. Me parece aceptable. Aut. 8.7.43
7.	1945 112	Reguera 5600/7743	8.000 3,50	<b>Colección Oasis</b> Aut. 17.11.45

*Tom Sawyer* in Spain (1938-1980)

8.	<b>1947</b> 160	Baguña 5088/8104	<b>10.</b> <b>000</b> 6	Aut.
9.	<b>1948</b> 500	Aguilar 4197/8416	<b>4.000</b> 20	<b>Colección Crisol</b> Aut.
10.	<b>1952</b> 292	Mateu 166/9762	<b>2.000</b>	<b>Colección Juvenil Cadete</b> Aut. 18.1.52
11.	<b>1952</b> 191	Tor 687/9796	<b>300</b> 12	Aut. 2.52
12.	<b>1952</b> 313	Cruzet 1565/9846	<b>2.000</b> 35	Nada inconveniente se aprecia en esta traducción catalana de esta conocida obra norteamericana. Aut. 22.4.52
13.	<b>1952</b> 1600	Aguilar 49-52/ 9754	<b>8.000</b> 200	<b>Colección Obras Eternas</b> Aut. 10.6.52 [Lector: Batanero]
14.	<b>1952</b> 100	Dólar 5438-52/ 10094	5	[Sin expediente]
15.	<b>1955</b> 274	SGEL 5672-55/ 11265	<b>300</b>	Puede autorizarse este original en inglés. [Edición de The Pocket Library, New York]
16.	<b>1956</b> 283	Cumbre 3713-56/ 11500	<b>2.000</b> 75	Novela de aventuras en un pueblecito en los Estados Unidos, siglo XIX. De acuerdo con anterior resolución se estima puede autorizarse. Aut. 28.7.56
17.	<b>1956</b> 185	Novaro 5422-56/ 11576	<b>50</b> 12	Nada que oponer a la anterior resolución. Aut 17.11.56 [Lector: Moreno de Munguía]
18.	<b>1957</b> 224	Juventud 351-57/ 11611	<b>4.000</b> 50	<b>Colección Juventud</b> Revisada esta novela, puede mantenerse la anterior autorización. Aut. 28.1.57 [Lector: Herrón]
19.	<b>1957</b> 773	Mateu 2240-57/ 11674	<b>5.000</b> 200	<b>Colección Cinco Mejores Obras</b> Nada que oponer a las anteriores autorizaciones. Aut. 21.5.57 [Lector: Moreno de Munguía]
20.	<b>1957</b> 242	Ferma 3623-57/ 11722	<b>2.000</b> 30	1. Colección Horizontes Juveniles, 8. Una serie de aventuras y anécdotas escolares que reflejan la vida real de los muchachos del Oeste americano del siglo pasado. Tiene alusiones a las prácticas religiosas protestantes en cuyo ambiente se desarrolla la acción y bastantes supersticiones propias de los niños y de los esclavos de aquella época. Su protagonista, un niño simpático, travieso y a veces muy alocado, coquetea con las niñas.

*Tom Sawyer in Spain (1938-1980)*

cont	<b>1957</b> 242	Ferma 3623-57/ 11722	<b>2.000</b> 30	Reparos: Páginas 56 y 57. Debe suprimirse todo lo tachado referente a la escena del beso en los labios que para ser 'prometidos' se dan el niño protagonista y una niña. Resulta inconveniente en un libro para niños de ocho a doce años como el presente. En otras ediciones como Juventud, Sopena, se ha suprimido. Es lástima que esta obra no se haya presentado en galeradas como debía presentarse toda obra editada en España. Aceptado con reparos. 2. Conforme con el criterio anterior por tratarse de un libro infantil. Aut. [con tachaduras] 23.12.57 [F. Aguirre]
21.	<b>1958</b> 156	Sopena 386-58/ 11918	<b>300</b> 18	Autorizada muy recientemente la importación de esta obra, no existen ahora motivos para variar el criterio primitivo de permisión. La historieta, desarrollada en un pueblecito de los Estados Unidos a finales del siglo XIX, con unos niños por protagonista. Puede autorizarse la importación. Aut. 30.1.58
22.	<b>1960</b> 96	Novaro 164-60/ 12638	<b>100</b> 42	Extracto de la novela para jóvenes. Puede autorizarse. Aut. 29.1.60 [Lector: Batanero]
23.	<b>1960</b> 64	FHER 1274-60/ 12696	<b>3.000</b>	<b>Colección: Para jóvenes</b> 1. Travesuras de un muchachito americano en compañía de algunos amigos, sobre todo del vagabundo Huckleberry. Reparos: paisaje en que un perro juega con un escarabajo dentro de la iglesia, algo irreverente, pagina 12. Escena entre Tom y una niña de su colegio poco apropiada, página 14. Al final de la obra proyectan hacerse ladrones y formar una banda, lo cual se deja en el aire, sin saber si lo van a realizar o no. El traductor ha debido querer 'convertir' los protestantes a católicos y así tan pronto sale la 'misa mayor' como el 'pastor'. Tampoco el quedarse con el tesoro encontrado que es producto del robo hecho por un bandido está muy bien. [Lector: Ibarra] 2. Creo que se puede permitir su publicación. Aut. 26.3.60 [F.Aguirre]
24.	<b>1960</b> 255	Bruguera 1864-60/ 12728	<b>4.000</b> 25	Aventuras humorísticas de un muchacho americano y un amigo suyo. Todas ellas trastadas de chicos y unas reflexiones morales del autor [adaptador] que neutralizan lo que pueda aver (sic) de poco edificante en la conducta de los chicos. Creo que se puede permitir su publicación. Aut. 9.4.60 [Lector: F. Aguirre]
25.	<b>1960</b> 262	Sopena 4077-60/ 12895	<b>5.000</b> 15	Examinada la obra de referencia y de acuerdo con anterior resolución, se estima que puede autorizarse. Aut. 11.8.60
26.	<b>1961</b> 21	FHER 150-61/ 13115	<b>3.000</b> 20	Puede autorizarse otra vez. Aut. 11.1.61 [Lector: Moreno de Munguía]



*Tom Sawyer in Spain (1938-1980)*

27.	1963 64	Ferma 3543-63/ 14626	5.000 20	<b>Colección Juvenil Amarilla</b> A través de múltiples ediciones se ha querido hacer de <i>Las aventuras de Tom Sawyer</i> un libro infantil. Sin embargo, no puede lograrse esto ni mucho menos eligiendo de las aventuras los pasajes macabros (desenterrar los cadáveres con vistas a venderlos), ni las escenas de crímenes y falsedades en la persona de Joe. Tal como se ha resumido la obra resulta además confusa y totalmente inadecuada para los niños. No debe editarse. Den. 5.7.63 [Lector: Sartorius]
28.	1963 64	Ferma 6620-63/ 14862	6.000 20	<b>Colección Juvenil Amarilla</b> Esta obra corresponde al expediente número 3543/63 presentado el 18 de junio 1963. No parece que se han suprimido los pasajes inadecuados. No obstante, con la advertencia 'Lectura para Adultos' puede editarse. Aut. [para adultos]
29.	1964 170	Llovet 1224-64/ 15051	5.000 125	<b>Colección: Jóvenes ambos sexos</b> Procede mantener la autorización concedida en el año 1963, con el número de expediente 6620, a la obra <i>Aventuras de Tom Sawyer</i> . Puede autorizarse. Aut. 21.5.64.
30.	1965 255	Bruguera 1233-65/ 15935	4.000 50	<b>Colección Histories</b> Puede autorizarse nuevamente. Aut. 20.2.65 [Versión en catalán]
31.	1966 224	Juventud 165-66/ 16947	3.000 80	<b>Colección Juventud</b> 1. Versión completa de la famosa obra que satiriza una época y un sector de la sociedad del Oeste americano, a través de las aventuras de su protagonista y sus inseparables Huck Finn y Joe Harper. Se acompaña informe de la obra. No debe autorizarse. Den. 5.2.66 [Lector: Sartorius; posteriormente añadió el comentario 'puede autorizarse indicando en la portada "Para Jóvenes"'] Informe: El carácter de la obra, en la que apenas se respetan los valores esenciales, hacen su lectura inconveniente para niños y adolescentes. Quedan destacados a continuación algunos pasajes que demuestran su inconveniencia: Págs. 23-24, 35, 37, 55, 58-59, 60, 90, 128-29, 130-31: amores prematuros. Págs. 33-34: burlas al maestro y a una escuela dominical, referente al estudio de la Biblia. Pág. 36: engaño de Tom para conseguir un premio sin merecimiento. Págs. 40-43: descripción burlesca de un oficio religioso protestante. Pág. 48: se exalta la vida de Huck, vagabundo de profesión. Pág. 70: profanación de una tumba. Pág. 71: asesinato. Pág. 121: grabado que ridiculiza al pastor protestante. Pág. 122: se describe humorísticamente el funeral por los falsos muertos Tom, Huck y Joe.

*Tom Sawyer in Spain (1938-1980)*

cont	<b>1966</b> 224	Juventud 165-66/ 16947	<b>3.000</b> 80	Págs. 142-45: se ridiculiza la intención moralizadora de ciertas composiciones escolares y se describe, según muestra el grabado de la pag. 144, la mofa de que es objeto el maestro, el día de fin de curso. Págs. 156-57: se ridiculiza la intervención de la policía. Pág. 219: se cita como Huck reniega de la civilización que lleva aparejada ir a la iglesia, escuela, etc. 2. Conforme. Aut. [para adultos] 24.2.66 [Fajardo]
32.	<b>1966</b> 1518	Aguilar 1561-66/ 17131	<b>5.000</b> 300	<b>Colección Obras Eternas</b> Procede mantener las autorizaciones concedidas, y dado que es manifiestamente una edición para adultos, extender la autorización a <i>Las aventuras de Tom Sawyer</i> . Aut. 25.2.66 [Lector: Fajardo]
33.	<b>1966</b> 224	Juventud 4910-66/ 17483	<b>3.000</b> 80	<b>Colección: Juvenil</b> 1. Esta obra fue sometida a lectura previa el 10 de enero del presente año, con número de expediente 165-66. Fue rechazada. En vista de que no ha habido supresiones de ningún tipo en esta nueva presentación, se recurre a las tachaduras. Por lo tanto, esta obra podría autorizarse en edición infantil y juvenil siempre que se tachen las frases marcadas en rojo en las páginas 23-24, 33-37, 39-43, 58-60, 122, 128-31, 142, 156, 219 y 221, y se supriman las ilustraciones de las páginas 120 y 143. 2. No comparto este criterio. [Fajardo] [Falta resolución]
34.	<b>1966</b> 255	Bruguera 7309-66/ 17681	<b>4.000</b> 35	<b>Colección Historias Selección</b> 1. Las travesuras de Tom Sawyer y sus inseparables amigos Huck y Joe son el punto de partida para una crítica de la sociedad americana de la época del autor que deja bastante malparados los valores esenciales. Faltan las páginas 2-3, 6-7, 10-11, 14-15. Reparos: Amores prematuros: 18, 20, 22, 50, 51, 54-57, 126, 128, 129. Burlas religiosas: 28-37, 38, 224, 118-20. Profanación de una tumba y asesinato: 66-71 Burlas al maestro: 141-48 Posturas antisociales: 248-52 Para editarse, deben atenuarse las escenas indicadas. [Lector: Sartorius] 2. Todo esto lo considero excesivo. Tramítese de orden del jefe del servicio. Aunque lo mejor sería devolverlo a la editorial por incomplete. [Fajardo] [Falta resolución]
35.	<b>1967</b> 262	Sopena 3055-67/ 18072	<b>10.000</b> 20	<b>Colección Biblioteca Sopena</b> 1. Versión íntegra de la conocida obra, en la cual se hace una crítica demoledora de los valores más esenciales, de las instituciones y la sociedad americana del pasado siglo, a través de las aventuras de Tom y su pandilla. El prólogo no va dirigido a menores.

*Tom Sawyer in Spain (1938-1980)*

cont	<b>1967</b> 262	Sopena 3055-67/ 18072	<b>10.000</b> 20	<p>Reparos:</p> <p>Amores prematuros: Páginas 29, 32, 33, 64, 68 a 71, 149 a 152</p> <p>Chacota sobre un oficio religioso: 45 a 51</p> <p>Profanación de una tumba y asesinato: 82 a 86</p> <p>Tom y sus amigos asisten a sus propios funerales, con la acostumbrada chanza a propósito de tal situación: 140</p> <p>Alusión inadecuada, de tono impúdico: 157</p> <p>Burla indiscriminada de una escuela y sus maestros: 167-68</p> <p>Idea negativa sobre el matrimonio: 184-85</p> <p>Irrespetuosidad hacia la jerarquía eclesiástica: 190</p> <p>Huck reniega de la civilización y de los principios fundamentales de convivencia: 256-57</p> <p>La obra es así totalmente negativa para lectores infantiles o juveniles y no debe editarse para ellos si no se suprimen o atenúan los pasajes señalados.</p> <p>2. Completamente de acuerdo con el dictamen anterior.</p> <p><b>Den.5.5.67.</b></p> <p>Aut. en revisión 18.6.67</p>
36.	<b>1967</b> 1562	Aguilar 3990-67 18145	<b>5.000</b> 450	<p><b>Colección Obras Eternas</b></p> <p>Puede mantenerse la autorización del expediente 1561-66.</p> <p>Aut. 17.5.67 [Lector: Fajardo]</p>
37.	<b>1967</b> 400	SRD 5626-67/ 18268	<b>15.000</b> 225	<p>1. Colección Libros Eternos para la Juventud. Adaptación de la famosa obra que critica a la sociedad americana del siglo pasado basándose en las aventuras de un grupo de muchachos.</p> <p>Amores prematuros: 9, 11, 23, 25, 26, 60, 61</p> <p>Burla y crítica de la religión y sus ministros: 12-16, 18-19, 24, 44, 57, 67</p> <p>Ideas negativas y chacota respecto a la escuela y los maestros: 16-17, 65-66</p> <p>Se exalta la haraganería, la ineducación y la falta de principios: 20, 43, 111-12</p> <p>Profanación de una tumba y asesinato: 28-30</p> <p>Idea detractora del matrimonio: 74</p> <p>El grabado número cuatro muestra el asesinato cometido en el cementerio.</p> <p>Debe eliminarse o paliarse notablemente todo lo indicado, para editar en colección juvenil. En otro caso, estimo que no debe autorizarse.</p> <p>2. Fundamentalmente de acuerdo con el dictamen anterior. Esta obra clásica, para editarse expresamente para como juvenil, conviene que sea prudentemente adaptada. Aunque mejor sería autorizarla para mayores.</p> <p>3. Autorizado previa consulta con el Director General.</p> <p>Autorizado 24.7.67.</p>
38.	<b>1968</b> 480	Aguilar 9906-68/ 19398	<b>5.000</b> 150	<p><b>Colección Crisol Literario</b></p> <p>Procede mantener la autorización concedida. Aut. 18.11.68</p>

*Tom Sawyer in Spain (1938-1980)*

39.	1969 32	Plan 10387-68/ 19436	10.000 10	<p><b>Carácter: Infantil</b></p> <p>1. Versión de la conocida obra, en viñetas, dirigida a niños. Muestra de comportamientos y palabras deseducativos. Insinuaciones de amores precoces. Asesinatos, intentos delictivos reiterados y escenas de niños en un cementerio. Alusiones a supersticiones y fantasmas. No se considera autorizable como infantil, a menos que se supriman los textos tachados (páginas 3, 6-8, 11, 13-15, 20-21).</p> <p>2. Conforme. Aut. [con tachaduras] 24.2.69</p>
40.	1969 224	Bruguera 722-69/ 57	6.000 25	<p><b>Carácter: Infantil</b></p> <p><b>Colección Historias Infantil</b></p> <p>1. Adaptación de la famosa obra de Mark Twain. Asesinato en el cementerio: págs. 60 y 62 del texto, 63 y 65 gráficas. Se desorbita la figura del maestro, al que se hace, disimulada y abiertamente, objeto de escarnio: págs. 118, 122, 124 del texto, y págs. 121 y 127 gráficas. Los pasajes señalados deben suprimirse o modificarse adecuadamente. Por lo demás, puede autorizarse (infantil y juvenil).</p> <p>2. De acuerdo con el dictamen precedente. Aut. [con tachaduras] 5.3.69</p>
41.	1969 8	Fénix 3438-69/ 405	15.000 10	<p><b>Carácter: Infantil</b></p> <p>Es una adaptación que prácticamente en nada conserva el nivel de la obra original de Twain. Sin embargo, no se ven inconvenientes para su autorización. Aut. 18.3.69</p>
42.	1970 188	Salvat 2359-70/ 147	400. 000 25	<p><b>Colección Libros RTVE</b></p> <p>Puede autorizarse otra vez. Aut. 4.3.70 [Lector: Moreno de Munguía]</p>
43.	1970 16	Plan 7624-70/ 490	12.000 12	<p><b>Carácter: Infantil</b></p> <p><b>Colección Clásicos Infantiles</b></p> <p>Autorizable (infantil). Aut. 28.7.70</p>
44.	1971 192	Bruguera 4084-71/ 257	4.000 50	<p><b>Colección Historias Selección</b></p> <p>1. En lectura de fecha 21 noviembre 1966 (expte. 7309-66) de esta misma adaptación de la obra de Twain, ya se hizo notar la conveniencia de evitar ciertos pasajes y contenidos de manifiesta inadecuación a menores. En esta nueva lectura se vuelven a advertir impropiedades para lectores jóvenes en las páginas 54, 56, 64 a 71, 78 a 81, 83, 224 (como más graves): alusiones a amores prematuros, profanación de una tumba y asesinato en cementerio; apreciación despiadada sobre un funeral etc.. Sería muy conveniente se modificasen al menos estos pasajes (en el libro marcados en rojo), si bien, dada su anterior autorización, quizás proceda mejor hacer coincidir la resolución que ahora se adopte con la tomada en la anterior ocasión. En todo caso, con estas enmiendas, es autorizable (juvenil).</p> <p>2. En rigor, no son graves las objeciones. Puede autorizarse. Aut. 5.5.71</p>

*Tom Sawyer in Spain (1938-1980)*

45.	1971 80	EPSC 5380-71/ 337	3.000 50	<p><b>Colección Bambalinas: Teatro Infantil y Juvenil</b></p> <p>1. Adaptación teatral de la obra de Mark Twain, estrenada en la temporada 1970-71 en el teatro Español por el Teatro Municipal Infantil de Madrid. En las páginas 11 a 15 se incluye la escena clave de la novela, en la que se profana una tumba y se comete un asesinato. La fidelidad al original no justifica que en una obra para menores aparezcan truculencias de este grado. Procede, pues, se suprima lo marcado en dichas páginas. Salvando estas inconveniencias, podría autorizarse (infantil). 2.6.71.</p> <p>2. En mi opinión, puede autorizarse para mayores de <i>catorce años</i>. Para lectura, rebasa lo infantil. 7.6.71.</p> <p>3. La Editorial manifiesta expresamente en la solicitud de autorización que esta obra, <i>con este texto</i>, se está representando dos veces por semana en el Teatro Español por la Compañía del Teatro Municipal Infantil de Madrid. Aut. 9.6.71.</p>
46.	1972 199	Bruguera 1671-72/ 103	4.000 50	<p><b>Carácter: Juvenil</b></p> <p><b>Colección Historias Selección</b></p> <p>1. Adaptación de la famosa obra de Twain, ya editada en varias reediciones en esta misma colección (Historias Selección). Vuelven a advertirse como improcedentes para menores en esta nueva lectura los pasajes que en páginas 54, 56, 57, 59, 64 a 71, 78 a 81, 83, 224 aluden a amores prematuros y refieren sin apenas paliativos la profanación de una tumba y el asesinato en un cementerio (ambos sucesos presenciados por menores) y, en la última de las páginas citadas, la apreciación despiadada e irrespetuosa que se hace de un funeral. Como en informe de lectura de antecedente más inmediato (fecha 28.4.1971, expte. 4084-71) se recomienda la supresión de tales inconveniencias, pese a que la obra sea, por lo demás, autorizable (juvenil).</p> <p>2. Mi opinión es que puede autorizarse para mayores de catorce años.</p> <p>3. Autorizado anteriormente. Aut. 25.2.72</p>
47.	1972 262	Sopena 3358-72/ 229	10.000 30	<p><b>Colección Biblioteca Sopena</b></p> <p>Procede mantener la autorización concedida. Aceptado el depósito. [Sin fecha]</p>
48.	1973 256	Everest 7446-73/ 453	2.500 100	<p><b>Colección Lecturas Everest 2000</b></p> <p>1. Las numerosas objeciones que desde el punto de vista de lectura para menores cabe hacer a esta adaptación de la novela de Twain 'califican el contenido total de la obra'. Repárese en las 81 páginas en las que se marcan improcedencias - más o menos evidentes a simple repaso - y se relacionan en cuartilla adjunta. Más parece, por la mayoría de ellas, que esta edición estuviera pensada para lectores adultos (cosa que desde luego no se evidencia así al leer varios fragmentos del propio prólogo que dejan a entender que se trata de una versión conscientemente destinada a público juvenil).</p>

*Tom Sawyer in Spain (1938-1980)*

cont	1973 256	Everest 7446-73/ 453	2.500 100	<p>En consecuencia, pues, a tal enfoque dado a la obra, <i>debería procederse a su denegación</i>, o, en decisión más condescendiente, comunicar a la editorial la larga lista de partes que merecen corrección.</p> <p>2. Aun concediendo que no es una obra concebida originariamente para niños, opino que puede autorizarse para mayores de catorce años.</p> <p>3. Es una adaptación. Parece lógico autorizarla al igual que precedentes adaptaciones (juvenil). Aut. 16.2.73</p>
49.	1973 255	Bruguera 5479-73/ 332	5.000 60	<p><b>Carácter: Juvenil</b> <b>Colección Historias Selección</b></p> <p>1. Sobre la improcedencia para menores de varios de los episodios de esta novela de Twain ya se han hecho observaciones en diversas ocasiones (referidas a esta adaptación en concreto); la última de ellas sobre la edición presentada con expte. 1671-72, referente a los pasajes - también ahora marcados - que en páginas 54, 56, 57, 59, 64 a 71, 78 a 81, 83, 224 'aluden a amores prematuros, profanación de una tumba y asesinato en un cementerio (presenciados estos dos últimos sucesos por menores) y apreciación despiadada e irrespetuosa sobre un funeral'. Al comprobarse en esa lectura que persisten las citadas inconveniencias, se sugiere una vez más su definitiva enmienda. De esta forma sería autorizable (juvenil).</p> <p>2. En mi opinión procede autorizarla para mayores de catorce años.</p> <p>3. Reimpresión. Autorizado 17.5.73.</p>
50.	1973 64	Boga 5766-73/ 351	10.000 35	<p><b>Carácter: Juvenil: niños y niñas</b> <b>Colección Amistad</b></p> <p>1. Con el fin de incluir la presente obra en colección infantil, el adaptador ha reducido la misma a la mínima expresión dejando en pie los reparos más graves del original, dado que constituyen el nudo del relato. Por considerar objetables para menores de doce años la profanación de tumbas y cadáveres y el asesinato, con los agravantes que concurren en la descripción hecha por el autor, se informa como conveniente proceder a la supresión de los párrafos señalados en las páginas 7, 8 y 16. Con estas enmiendas podría autorizarse (Infantil). [Lectora: María Carmen Rute]</p> <p>2. En mi opinión procede autorizarse.</p> <p>3. En categoría infantil parece procedente la supresión de lo acotado en páginas 7, 8 y 16. Aut. [con tachaduras] 6.6.73</p>
51.	1973 256	Everest 7446-73/ 453	3.000 100	<p><b>Colección Lecturas Everest</b></p> <p>1. Esta adaptación de la novela de Twain ya fue leída e informada desfavorablemente para menores en fecha 5.2.1973 (expte.1085-73). Al parecer, en dicha ocasión se decidió, no obstante, por acceder a su autorización, atendiendo a que 'parece lógico autorizarla al igual que precedentes adaptaciones'.</p>

*Tom Sawyer in Spain (1938-1980)*

cont	<b>1973</b> 256	Everest 7446-73/ 453	<b>3.000</b> 100	En buen sentido, es dado pensar que para esta reimpresión se decida por la autorización. Aun con ello, este lector estima que al menos debieran evitarse las referencias y alusiones que se hacen en páginas 66, 67, 76 a 82, 90, 92, 94, 169, 172, 174, 208 a la profanación de una tumba y a asesinato en un cementerio. 2. Aut. 19.7.73
52.	<b>1973</b> 224	Juventud 11416-73/ 701	<b>3.000</b> 160	<b>Colección Juventud</b> Aut. 31.10.73
53.	<b>1974</b> 255	Bruguera 51-74/4	- 60	Aut. 10.1.74
54.	<b>1974</b> 239	EDAF 1475-74/ 107	<b>5.000</b> 100	<b>Colección Juvenil EDAF</b> Aut. 11.2.74
55.	<b>1974</b> 101	La Gaya Ciencia 1495-74/ 108	<b>6.000</b> 120	<b>Carácter: Juvenil</b> <b>Colección Moby Dick Biblioteca de Bolsillo Junior</b> Aut. 11.2.74
56.	<b>1974</b> 260	Sopena 6997-74/ 441	<b>10.000</b> 50	Aceptado. 17.6.74
57.	<b>1974</b> 60	Toray 8086-74/ 515	<b>8.000</b> 400	<b>Carácter: Juvenil</b> <b>Colección Novelas Maestras Toray</b> Autorizado. 5.8.74
58.	<b>1974</b> 196	Rodas 5341-74/ 341	<b>10.000</b> 90	<b>Colección Juvenil Rodas</b> Aut. 11.9.74 [Tachaduras en galeradas]
59.	<b>1974</b> 223	Paulinas 5497-74/ 352	<b>10.000</b> 150	<b>Carácter: Juvenil</b> <b>Colección Junior Capitán</b> Aut. 21.9.74 [Tachaduras en galeradas]
60.	<b>1975</b> 192	Bruguera 274-75/ 14	<b>5.000</b> 80	<b>Carácter: Juvenil</b> <b>Colección Historias Selección</b> Aut. 20.1.75
61.	<b>1975</b> 54	Sedmay 7910-75/ 368	<b>5.000</b> 125	<b>Carácter: Infantil</b> Aut. 1.8.75
62.	<b>1975</b> 223	Bruguera 9289-75/ 426	<b>5.000</b> 50	<b>Colección Historias Infantil</b> Aut. 29.9.75

*Tom Sawyer* in Spain (1938-1980)

63.	<b>1975</b> 60	<b>SIMA</b> 12949-75/ 592	<b>5.000</b> 49	<b>Carácter: Juvenil: niños y niñas</b> Aut. 12.12.75 [Tachaduras en galeradas]
64.	<b>1976</b> 255	<b>Bruguera</b> 5015-76/ 200	<b>5.000</b> 100	<b>Carácter: Juvenil</b> <b>Colección Historias Selección</b> Aut. 7.5.76
65.	<b>1977</b> 200	<b>Toray</b> 4460-77/ 154	<b>12.000</b> 150	<b>Carácter: Juvenil</b> <b>Colección Huracán</b> Aut. 11.4.77
66.	<b>1977</b> 64	<b>FHER</b> 6188-77/ 228	<b>10.000</b> 125	<b>Colección Inmortales</b> Aut. (juvenil). 18.5.77 [Tachaduras en galeradas]
67.	<b>1978</b> 64	<b>Toray</b> 5694-78/ 173	<b>3.000</b> 340	<b>Carácter: Infantil</b> <b>Colección Novelas Maestras Toray</b> Aut. 24.5.78
68.	<b>1980</b> 48	<b>Disney/ Toray</b> 12730-80/ 281	<b>5.000</b> 250	<b>Carácter: Infantil</b> <b>Colección Colosos Disney</b> 11.12.1980.



### Appendix C: Other Works by Mark Twain (1942-1967)

	Year Pp.	Title Exp./Caja	Publ. P-run Price	Report
1.	1942 400	<i>Aventuras de Huck Finn</i> 5-182/6967	Nausica 2.000	Autorizado 18.8.42
2.	1943	<i>Tom Sawyer detective y otras dos narraciones</i> 4516/7206	Nausica 2.000	Valor literario: Bueno, como todo de este célebre autor, si bien no es de lo mejor de su producción. <i>Tachaduras</i> : Pág.70 ( <i>El legado de 30.000 dólares</i> . <i>Otras observaciones</i> : Son tres cuentos; los dos primeros humorísticos; de los tres el menos bien hecho es el primero, que utiliza a la ya inmortal figura de Tom Sawyer, como detective, notándose que el cuento ha sido escrito por afán de lucro. El tercer cuento ridiculiza, sin maldad, a la secta protestante presbiteriana y al puritanismo norteamericano. Me parece en todo publicable. Autorizado [con tachaduras] 21.7.43
3.	1943 346	<i>Aventuras de Huck Finn</i> 7206/7282	Nausica 2.000	Novela de humorismo al estilo de nuestra picaresca. Muy entretenida y nada censurable. Autorizado 9.11.43
4.	1943 296	<i>Aventuras de Huck Finn</i> 7325/7285	Molino 12.000	Una extensa novela cuajada de incidencias y aventuras a semejanza de las de nuestra picaresca. La traducción ajustada a un correcto estilo. Autorizado 9.11.43
5.	1945	<i>Aventuras de Huck Finn</i> 3069/7681	Oteyza 450	[Solicitud para importar versión de Acme-Agency, Buenos Aires]. Autorizado 6.8.45
6.	1967 352	<i>Aventuras de Huck Finn</i> 3053-67/ 18072	Sopena 10.000 30	<i>Informe</i> : La viuda de Douglas adopta a Huck para que deje de ser un vagabundo como su padre. El muchacho no se adapta a la civilización y huye por el río en una almadía que comparte con el negro Jim, fugitivo también de la vida de esclavitud. En sus correrías se les unen dos tipos indeseables, timadores de oficio, con los cuales viven azarosas aventuras hasta que logran zafarse de ellos. <i>Reparos</i> : Págs. 16, 17, 26, 27, 44, 57, 68, 140, 141, 165 a 167, 202, 278: Burlas ya irónicas, ya sarcásticas, de la religión. Pág. 45: Explosión racista a cargo de un borracho. Págs. 131 a 134: Chacota respecto a la muerte de dos personas. Págs. 144 a 147: Fuga de una pareja de enamorados. Págs. 192, 193: Ataque a la autoridad representada en los reyes.

Other Works by Mark Twain (1942-1967)

cont				<p>Págs 202 a 210: Capítulo que no deja nada en pie.  Págs. 220 a 223: Humor macabro irreprimido.  Págs. 258 a 260: Idea sobre la oración que, siendo aparentemente ingenua, resulta negativa o, al menos, peligrosamente equívoca.  El prólogo no va dirigido, ni mucho menos, a lectores de corta edad. La obra, como otras de este autor, es negativa de principio a fin para menores. Sólo suprimiendo o paliando notablemente las partes indicadas sería autorizable como obra juvenil.  Autorizado en edición no infantil ni juvenil 5.5.67</p>
7.	1967 190	<i>Tom Sawyer detective y Tom Sawyer en el extranjero</i> 3054-67/ 18072	Sopena 10.000 20	<p>Dos aventuras de <i>Tom Sawyer</i>. En la primera soluciona un enrevesado asunto policiaco. En la segunda emprende un viaje en globo por el continente africano. Ambas historias tienen más atenuado el sello de ironía destructiva propia del autor.  <i>Tachaduras:</i>  Pág.75: Mordacidad respecto a un pastor protestante.  Pág.127: Idea destructora de la compasión y ayuda mutua.  Debe suprimirse o atenuarse lo indicado (particularmente en la pág.75) para publicarla como obra juvenil. Autorizada en edición no infantil/juvenil 26.5.67</p>

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

References for the censorship documents pertaining to the Spanish translations of the *William* books, *The Adventures of Tom Sawyer* and other works by Mark Twain are cited in full in Appendices A to C. These references are not repeated here. Translations used in the course of this dissertation, but for which censorship documents were not consulted are, however, cited in Section I.6.

The following abbreviations are used in this Bibliography:

*BH* - *Bibliografía Hispánica*

*BOE* - *Boletín Oficial del Estado*

INLE - Instituto Nacional del Libro Español

### I. PRIMARY SOURCES

#### 1. Francoist textbooks for children

Alonso de Burgos, Emilio, *Cortésia juvenil* (Madrid: Don Bosco, 1967)

Anonymous, *Así quiero ser: El niño del Nuevo Estado*, 2nd edn (Burgos: Hijos de Santiago Rodríguez, 1940)

Anonymous, *Así quiero ser: El niño del Nuevo Estado*, 3rd edn (Burgos: Hijos de Santiago Rodríguez, 1944)

Anonymous, *Lecturas*, 16th edn (Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1945)

Cereceda, Feliciano, *Historia del Imperio Español y de la Hispanidad* (Madrid: Razón y Fe, 1940)

Dalmáu Carles, José, *Infancia: Libro segundo* (Gerona: Pla, 1960)

Edelvives, *Lecturas graduadas: Libro primero* (Zaragoza: Luis Vives, 1953)

Fernández Rodríguez, Antonio, *Panorama: Tercer libro de lecturas* (Plasencia: Sánchez Rodrigo, 1942)

Juvilla, Pablo, *Rutas de orientación juvenil* (Madrid: Coculsa, 1958)

Onieva, Antonio J., *Héroes* (Burgos: Hijos de Santiago Rodríguez, 1951)

Salaverriá, José María, *El muchacho español* (San Sebastián: Librería Internacional, [1938])

Sarabia, Ramón, *A los niños pláticas y ejemplos*, (Barcelona, Imprenta Pulcra, [1933])

Serrano de Haro, Agustín, *España es así*, 4th edn (Madrid: Escuela Española, 1940)

Serrano de Haro, Agustín, *España es así*, 24th edn (Madrid: Escuela Española, 1964)

Serrano de Haro, Agustín, *Yo soy español*, 26th edn (Madrid: Escuela Española, 1966)

Werner, Carmen, *Convivencia social* (Madrid: Sección Femenina de FET y de las JONS, 1957)

#### 2. Articles in official Francoist journals and newspapers

Cervera y Jiménez Alfaro, Francisco, 'Orientación editorial sobre el libro infantil', *BH*, 5.5 (May 1946), 285-289

Herrero, M., 'Estadísticas y comentarios', *BH* 1.5 (1942), 1-7

Lasso de la Vega, J., 'La selección de libros: reglas para bibliotecarios, editores, libreros y lectores', *BH*, 4.1 (January 1945), 1-25

Montañés Fontenla, Luis, 'Un nuevo aspecto de la actividad editorial: La publicación de cuadernos infantiles de historietas gráficas', *BH*, 4.6 (June 1945), 343-55

Montañés Fontenla, Luis, 'Análisis de un sorprendente éxito editorial', *BH*, 9.2 (February 1950), 23-34

Pemartín, Julián, 'Exposición simbólica del Instituto Nacional del Libro', *BH*, 2.5 (May 1943), 1-11

Quintana, José de, 'Lecturas de la juventud', *Solidaridad Nacional*, 12 May 1943, p.2

Toral, Carolina, 'Más sobre orientación editorial: Ensayo de selección de bibliotecas para niñas de 11 a 16 años', *BH*, 5.7 (July 1946), 455-63  
Untitled editorial, *BH*, 1.1 (May-June 1942), 1-2

### 3. Official bibliographies

Gabinete de Lectura Santa Teresa de Jesús, *Catálogo crítico de libros para niños* (Madrid: Consejo Superior de Mujeres de Acción Católica, 1945)  
Gabinete de Lectura Santa Teresa de Jesús, *Catálogo crítico de libros para niños* (Madrid: Dirección General de Archivos y Bibliotecas, 1954)  
Gabinete de Lectura Santa Teresa de Jesús, *Catálogo crítico de libros para niños: 1957-1960* (Madrid: Servicio Nacional de Lectura, 1961)  
Gabinete de Lectura Santa Teresa de Jesús, *Catálogo crítico de libros para niños: 1962-1965* (Madrid: Servicio Nacional de Lectura, 1967)  
Gabinete de Lectura Santa Teresa de Jesús, *Catálogo crítico de libros para niños: 1966-1969* (Madrid: Ministerio de Educación y Ciencia, 1972)  
Gabinete de Lectura Santa Teresa de Jesús, *Catálogo crítico de libros para niños: 1970-1972* (Madrid: Servicio Nacional de Lectura, 1975)  
Gabinete de Lectura Santa Teresa de Jesús, *Selección de lecturas para niños y adolescentes* (Madrid: Servicio Nacional de Lectura, 1963)  
Garmendia de Otaola, A., *Lecturas buenas y malas a la luz del dogma y de la moral*, 3rd edn (Bilbao: Mensajero del Corazón de Jesús, 1961)  
INLE, *Libros infantiles y juveniles* (Madrid: Ministerio de Información y Turismo, 1965)  
INLE, *Libros infantiles y juveniles* (Madrid: Ministerio de Información y Turismo, 1970)  
Ladrón de Guevara, Pablo, *Novelistas buenos y malos*, 2nd edn (Bilbao: Mensajero del Corazón de Jesús, [1910])

### 4. Legislative texts (listed chronologically).

'Orden del Ministerio de Interior (29.4.38)', *BOE*, 556 (1938), 7035-36  
'Circular número 48 (7 septiembre 1943)', *BH*, 2.8 (September-October 1943), 49  
'Circular número 52 (30 septiembre 1943)', *BH*, 2.8 (September-October 1943), 49  
'Circular número 57 (22 noviembre 1943)', *BH*, 2.9 (November-December 1943), 82-84  
'Circular número 59 (1 diciembre 1943)', *BH*, 2.9 (November-December 1943), 84  
'Decreto 24 junio 1955 (núm.1053)', *BOE*, 204 (23 July 1955), 4509; Aranzadi, *Repertorio cronológico de legislación* (Pamplona: Aranzadi, 1955), pp.843-44  
'Orden 24 junio 1955 (Desarrollo del Decreto de esta fecha)', *BOE*, 33 (2 February 1956), 841; Aranzadi, 1956, pp.249-54  
'Estatuto de publicaciones infantiles y juveniles (Decreto 19 enero 1967, núm. 195/67, Ministerio de Información y Turismo)', *BOE*, 37 (13 February 1967); Aranzadi, 1967, pp.387-90

### 5. Fictional Works (in original language)

Anonymous, *Aventuras de Marmolillo* (Barcelona: Sopena, [n.d.])  
Crompton, Richmal, *Just William* (MacMillan: London and Basingstoke, 1983)  
Crompton, Richmal, *Still William* (London and Basingstoke: MacMillan, 1984)  
Crompton, Richmal, *William the Bad* (Newnes: London, 1930)  
Goytisolo, Juan, *Señas de identidad* (Mexico: Joaquín Mortiz, 1966)  
Pérez Galdós, Benito, *Tormento* (Madrid: Alianza, 1994)  
Soriano Izquierdo, José, and others, *Jaimito* (Valencia, Editorial Valenciana, 1944-[?])  
Twain, Mark (pseud. of Samuel Langhorne Clemens) *Tom Sawyer and Huckleberry Finn* (Ware: Wordsworth, 1992)

Vañó, E., and Puerto, T., *Roberto Alcázar, el intrépido aventurero español* (Valencia: Editorial Valenciana, 1940-1975).

#### 6. Translations (excluding those cited in Appendices)

Hesse, Hermann, *Steppenwolf*, trans. by Basil Creighton, (Harmondsworth, Middlesex and Ringwood, Australia: Penguin, 1973)

Kundera, Milan, *The Joke*, trans. by Michael Henry Heim (London: Faber and Faber, 1983)

Twain, Mark, *El detective distraído* (Barcelona: Bruguera, 1964)

Twain, Mark, *Las aventuras de Tom Sawyer*, trans. by Simón Santainés (Barcelona: Lauro, 1945)

Twain, Mark, *Huck Finn, el negro, y Tom Sawyer*, trans. by Simón Santainés (Barcelona: Mateu, 1957)

#### 7. Censorship documents (excluding those cited in Appendices)

Alcott, Louisa May, *Hombrecitos*, Juventud, Ext.1765/7073 (1943)

Disney, Walt, *Blanc neiges et les sept nains* [sic], Hachette, 1575-68/17132

Emerson, Ralph Waldo, *Normas mentales*, Tor (Saturnino Calleja), 6533-50/9357

Figueroa, Trini de, *Paréntesis de inquietud*, Bruguera, 176-52/9762

Fortún, Elena (pseud. of Encarnación Aragoneses Urquijo), *Cuchifritín el hermano de Celia*, Aguilar, K-698/6486 (1940); 917-43/7101 (1943)

Fortuny, Carlos, *La Fornarina y su tiempo*, the author, 57-60/12629

Hugo, Victor, *Los miserables*, Tor, 4565-51/9673

Irigaray Echevarry, Isabel, *Quiéreme con locura*, Bruguera, 6152-60/13048

Lozano Rico, Juan, *Tu pasión mortal*, Bruguera, 7359-68/19198

Musset, Alfred de, *La confesión de un hijo del siglo*, Sopena, 122-58/11896

Philippe, André, *La Izquierda: Mitos y Realidades*, Estela, 8520-65/16795

Romero Sánchez-Herrera, Manuel, *Durandín: Estampas de la Guerra Civil*, the author, 2358-70/147

Salgari, Emilio, *Últimas aventuras del corsario negro*, Marisal, 6-864/7036 (1942)

Stevenson, Robert Louis, *El extraño caso del doctor Jekyll y el señor Hyde*, Apolo, 6-507/7028 (1942)

Stoker, Bram, *Drácula*, Castalia, 2-335/6824 (1942)

Tellado, Corín, (pseud. of María del Socorro Tellado López), *Mentira sentimental*, Rollán, 5312-65/16445

Torras Presas, Antonio, *Una de tantas*, Bruguera, 7355-68/19198

Torrente, Loló de la, *Memoria y Razón de Diego Rivera*, Ancla, 984-60/12683

Various authors, *La novia de la tormenta: Narraciones terroríficas*, Molino, Ext.1059/7070 (1941)

## II. SECONDARY SOURCES

### 1. Works on censorship

Abellán, Manuel L., *Censura y creación literaria en España (1939-1976)* (Barcelona: Editorial Península, 1980)

Beneyto, Antonio, *Censura y política en los escritores españoles* (Barcelona: Plaza y Janés, 1977)

Butt, John, 'Spain's skin-deep liberalism', *Index on Censorship*, 3.2 (1974), 51-53

Cisquella, Georgina, José Luis Erviti, and José A. Sorolla, *Diez años de represión cultural: La censura de libros durante la Ley de Prensa (1966-1976)* (Barcelona: Anagrama and others, 1977)

Diéguez, Diego (pseud.), 'Spain's Golden Silence', *Index on Censorship*, 2.2 (1973), 91-99

Goytisolo, Juan, 'Los escritores españoles frente al toro de la censura', in *El furgón de cola* (Barcelona: Seix Barral, 1976)

Gubern, Román, *La censura: Función política y ordenamiento jurídico bajo el franquismo (1936-1975)* (Barcelona: Península, 1981)

LaPrade, Douglas Edward, *La Censura de Hemingway en España* (Salamanca: Universidad de Salamanca, 1991)

Labanyi, Jo, 'Censorship or the Fear of Mass Culture', in *Spanish Cultural Studies: An Introduction*, ed. by Helen Graham and Jo Labanyi (Oxford: OUP, 1995), pp.207-14

Sánchez Reboledo, José, *Palabras Tachadas: Retórica contra censura* (Alicante: Instituto de Estudios Juan Gil Albert, 1988)

## 2. Works on children's literature

Bravo Villasante, Carmen, *Historia de la literatura infantil española*, 4th edn (Madrid: Doncel, 1983)

Cendán Pazos, Fernando, *Medio siglo de libros infantiles y juveniles en España* (Madrid: Fundación Germán Sánchez Ruipérez, 1986)

Cleary Nichols, Geraldine, 'Children's Literature in Spain (1939-1950): Ideology and Practice', in *Fascismo y experiencia literaria: Reflexiones para una recanonización*, ed. by Hernán Vidal (Minneapolis: Society for the Study of Contemporary Hispanic and Lusophone Revolutionary Literatures, 1985), pp.213-21

Dorfmann, Ariel, and Armand Mattelart, *How to read Donald Duck: Imperialist Ideology in the Disney Comic*, trans. by David Kunzle (New York: International General, 1975)

Fernández López, Marisa, *Traducción y literatura juvenil: Narrativa anglosajona contemporánea en España* (León: Universidad de León, 1996)

Gasca, Luis, *Tebeo y cultura de masas* (Madrid: Prensa Española, 1966)

Gasca, Luis, *Los comics en España* (Barcelona: Lumen, 1969)

Guelbenzu, J.M., 'Guillermo o la imaginación', *Cuadernos para el diálogo*, 64-65 (January-February 1969), 40

Hunt, Peter, *Criticism, Theory and Children's Literature* (Basil Blackwell: Cambridge, MA, 1991)

Miguel, Amando de, 'La transmisión de las ideologías autoritarias a través de los textos escolares', *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*, supplement no.3 'Fascismo y Educación' (September 1976), 32-34

Moret, Xavier, 'Travesuras en España', *El País*, 6 September 1990, p.20

Rivas, Rosa, 'Un chico para la eternidad', *El País* (Semanal), 28 September 1980, pp.4-5

Rose, Jacqueline, *The Case of 'Peter Pan' or the Impossibility of Children's Fiction* (Basingstoke and London: Macmillan, 1984)

Savater, Fernando, 'El pragmático', *El País*, 6 September 1990, p.21

Savater, Fernando, 'El triunfo de los proscritos' in Fernando Savater, *La infancia recuperada* (Madrid: Taurus, 1976)

Sopeña Monsalve, Andrés, *El florido pensil: Memorias de la escuela nacionalcatólica* (Barcelona: Crítica, 1994)

## 3. Other works

Bozal, Valeriano, 'La edición en España: Notas para su historia', *Cuadernos para el Diálogo*, 14 Extraordinario (May 1969), 85-93

Carandell, José María, 'Lejos de nosotros la funesta manía de pensar', *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*, supplement no.3 'Fascismo y Educación' (September 1976), 30-31

Chislett, William, *The Spanish Media since Franco* (London: Writers and Scholars Educational Trust, 1979)

Chomsky, Noam, *Deterring Democracy* (London: Vintage, 1992)

- Ellwood, Sheelagh, 'The Moving Image of the Franco Regime: Noticiarios y Documentales' in *Spanish Cultural Studies: An Introduction*, ed. by Helen Graham and Jo Labanyi (Oxford: OUP, 1995), pp.201-03
- Equipo Reseña, *La cultura española bajo el franquismo* (Bilbao: Mensajero, 1977)
- Foucault, Michel, *The History of Sexuality. Volume I: An Introduction*, trans. by Robert Hurley (London: Penguin, 1979)
- Gallo, Max, *Histoire de l'Espagne franquiste*, (Paris: Ruedo Ibérico, 1971)
- Graham, Helen, 'Gender and the State: Women in the 1940s' in *Spanish Cultural Studies: An Introduction*, ed. by Helen Graham and Jo Labanyi (Oxford: OUP, 1995), pp.182-95
- Hurtley, Jacqueline A., *José Janés: editor de literatura inglesa* (Barcelona: Promociones y Publicaciones Universitarias, 1992)
- Jagoe, Catherine, *Ambiguous Angels: Gender in the Novels of Galdós* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California, 1994)
- Monés, Jordi, 'Cuatro décadas de educación franquista: aspectos ideológicos', *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*, supplement no.3 'Fascismo y Educación' (September 1976), 11-12
- Muñoz, Jacobo, 'El franquismo: un fascismo a la española', *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*, supplement no.3 'Fascismo y Educación' (September 1976), 4-9
- Nietzsche, Friedrich, *On the Genealogy of Morals*, (New York: Random House, 1969)
- Preston, Paul, *The Triumph of Democracy in Spain* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1986)
- Preston, Paul, 'Materialism and Serie Negra', in *Leeds Papers on Thrillers in the Transition: Novela Negra and Political Change in Spain*, ed. by Rob Rix (Leeds: Trinity and All Saints College, 1992)
- Preston, Paul, *Franco: A Biography*, (London: HarperCollins, 1993)
- Ridruejo, Dionisio, *Casi unas memorias* (Madrid: Planeta, 1976)
- Ruiz Rico, Juan, *El sexo de sus señorías: Sexualidad y tribunales de justicia en España* (Madrid: Temas de Hoy, 1991)
- Schapiro, Leonard, *Totalitarianism*, (London: Pall Mall Press, 1972)
- Stoodt, Dieter, 'Alemania: orígenes históricos y actualidad de la ideología fascista en la educación', *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*, supplement no.3 'Fascismo y Educación' (September 1976), 50-53
- Subirats, Marina, 'La mujer domada', *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*, supplement no.3 'Fascismo y Educación' (September 1976), 43-44
- Tejada, Luis Alonso, *La represión sexual en la España de Franco*, (Barcelona: Caralt, 1977)
- Tuñón de Lara, Manuel, 'La interpretación policial de la historia', *Cuadernos de Pedagogía*, supplement no.3 'Fascismo y Educación' (September 1976), 35-37
- Valls, Fernando, *La enseñanza de la literatura en el franquismo (1936-1951)* (Barcelona: Antoni Bosch, 1983)

